986

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

NIJ

National Institute of Justice | *Program Announcement*

Sponsored Research Programs

Fiscal Year 1986

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY

JAN 3 1986

U. S. GOVT. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 378

J 28. 24/2:

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. Priority is given to policy-relevant research that can yield approaches and information that State and local agencies can use in preventing and reducing crime. The decisions made by criminal justice practitioners and policymakers affect millions of citizens, and crime affects almost all our public institutions and the private sector as well. Targeting resources, assuring their effective allocation, and developing new means of cooperation between the public and private sector are some of the emerging issues in law enforcement and criminal justice that research can help illuminate.

Carrying out the mandate assigned by Congress in the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, the National Institute of Justice:

- Sponsors research and development to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and related civil justice aspects, with a balanced program of basic and applied research.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of justice improvement programs and identifies programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- Tests and demonstrates new and improved approaches to strengthen the justice system, and recommends actions that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations and individuals to achieve this goal.
- Disseminates information from research, demonstrations, evaluations, and special programs to Federal, State, and local governments, and serves as an international clearinghouse of justice information.
- Trains criminal justice practitioners in research and evaluation findings, and assists practitioners and researchers through fellowships and special seminars.

Authority for administering the Institute and awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements is vested in the NIJ Director. In establishing its research agenda, the Institute is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems and to plan research that can help resolve them. Current priorities are:

- Alleviating jail and prison crowding
- Assisting victims of crime
- Enhancing involvement of community resources and the private sector in controlling crime
- Reducing violent crime and apprehending the career criminal
- Reducing delay and improving the effectiveness of the adjudication process
- Providing better and more cost-effective methods for managing the criminal justice system
- Assessing the impact of probation and parole on subsequent criminal behavior
- Enhancing Federal, State, and local cooperation in crime control

James K. Stewart

Director

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

Sponsored Research Programs

Fiscal Year 1986

November 1985

National Institute of Justice
James K. Stewart
Director

Foreword

In the recent past, our thoughts and understanding about crime were considerably different, based largely on personal experience or theories that could not be empirically validated. Today, however, epochal changes are occurring in the way our society views crime and criminal justice. Research, carefully targeted on contemporary concerns, offers the best hope for pushing the frontiers of our knowledge about controlling crime and finding out what works in criminal justice.

Fifteen years ago, when major research on crime and justice was just beginning, there was overwhelming support for the view that societal factors--alienation, unemployment, poverty--were causing the soaring crime rates of the 1960's and 1970's. Criminal offenders were seen as victims of a "disease" that could be cured with appropriate treatment.

At the same time, criminal justice policies were undergoing significant change. Police procedures from evidence collection to arrest and use of force were altered, with new procedures mandated by the courts. Arrests became more time-consuming, prosecution more complex, trials more intricate, and appeals more voluminous. We were expending more resources on fewer cases with diminished results for public safety.

As this natural experiment with one model of the causes and control of crime proceeded, both experience and research began to call into question the basic assumptions of the policies.

However popular with some disciplines, the "medical model" failed to account for the fact that the majority of people living in disadvantaged circumstances were noncriminal, and that employed, educated, professional people committed a wide variety of crime, both white collar and personal. Research on rehabilitation could find no conclusive evidence that offenders could be "cured" through available programs and treatment. Coupled with the dramatic changes in official procedures for dealing with crime, the chances of going to prison dropped significantly, so that by the 1980's, the risk of imprisonment was only half what it was in 1960.

Most important, throughout the period, crime rose inexorably. As James Q. Wilson noted in Thinking About Crime, ". . .it rose at a faster rate and to higher levels than at any time since the 1930's and, in some categories, to higher levels than any experienced in this century."

The toll of crime, communicated through the media, word of mouth, and visible urban decay, created a pervasive sense of vulnerability in the public. Riots, anger, and fear fractured communities. Those who could moved to zones of safety away from the city. Crime and fear controlled many decisions about where individuals would live, shop, work, and educate their children. Business and commerce decisions also turned on questions of public safety.

Now we are in the midst of another natural experiment in crime control policy and practice. It has been prompted in part by a sense that criminal justice policies have not provided fairness and protection to victims of crime. It recognizes that individuals must be held responsible for their behavior.

The new approach is based on the realization that victimization has profound effects beyond the predator and victim. Crime and fear change the entire dynamics of communities, and solutions must go beyond the criminal justice system. The past trend toward leaving crime control entirely to government missed the most important element--people and communities. A new partnership between the public and criminal justice is emerging, on the theory that citizens and their institutions, working in concert, can have a profound impact on discouraging crime.

The fiscal year 1986 program of the National Institute of Justice seeks to build on understanding of the failures of past models of crime control policy and to provide objective information about current approaches, thus establishing the utility of research for policymakers. We need to learn more about the costs and benefits of crime prevention, and how citizens, the private sector, and criminal justice can work together to stop crime before it occurs. Similarly, research must continue to search for ways to deter serious offenders from future crimes.

The issue of crime is a top domestic policy issue on virtually every public opinion poll. President Reagan and Attorney General Meese support research with real utility for criminal justice, experiments that use our modest research resources to provide penetrating answers that can guide the critical decisions made every day by criminal justice administrators.

Since I became director of the Institute, I have urged criminal justice agencies to open their operations to researchers, and they have responded positively. But research results will play a role in

their decisions only if they are relevant and tell us what works. The 3-year drop in crime rates that occurred, for example, is the result of a combination of factors that research ought to be able to discern and describe for the benefit of policymakers and practitioners.

Much has been done in the past four years in criminal justice, but much more remains to be accomplished. We have seen passage of the Comprehensive Crime Control legislation, which includes consideration of danger to the community in release and sentencing, seizure of assets, and abolition of parole. Task Forces on drug interdiction and treaties with source countries are aimed at reducing the drug supplies that research has shown fuel so much crime. A new Sentencing Commission is beginning its work of formulating appropriate guidelines for sentencing. The Commission will focus on research as one resource for information that can help shape policy. A Victims' Fund has been created, not with taxpayers' money, but with criminal fines. Mandatory penalties for drunk driving and for using a gun in a crime, and longer terms to incapacitate convicted criminals have become a reality.

This is a time of change in crime control and of challenge to research to demonstrate the power of the experiment. We now have a data base from 15 years of research and encouraging examples of breakthroughs in shaping criminal justice policy through research. Experiments on family violence, on drugs and crime, on police practices and deployment--these demonstrate the contributions research can make.

The National Institute of Justice urges researchers to use this plan to work with practitioners and develop projects that will build on these contributions and give us the tools we need to make greater inroads against crime.

James K. Stewart
Director

READEX FICHE
best copy available

Contents

Foreword iii

I. Introduction 1

II. Programs of the National Institute of Justice 2

III. Research priorities 3

IV. Application procedures 5

V. Program announcements 7

A. Serious offender 7

1. Crime control theory and policy 7

2. Offender classification and prediction of criminal behavior 9

3. Violent criminal behavior 11

4. Drugs, alcohol, and crime 13

B. Victims of crime 16

C. Crime prevention 18

D. Criminal justice system 20

1. Police efficiency and effectiveness 20

2. Police response to spouse assault 22

3. Court effectiveness 25

4. Corrections 27

5. The system of criminal justice 28

E. Fellowship programs 31

1. Visiting Fellows 31

2. Graduate Research Fellowships 32

3. Summer Research Fellowships 32

VI. Application forms follow page 33

I. Introduction

The National Institute of Justice is the principal Federal agency for research, development, evaluation and dissemination of programs to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system. Included in its mandate are the following activities:

1) to provide more accurate information on the causes and correlates of crime and juvenile delinquency, 2) to develop new methods for the prevention and reduction of crime, 3) to evaluate the effectiveness of criminal justice programs, 4) to make recommendations for action to Federal, State, and local governments for the improvement of their systems of criminal justice, and 5) to serve as a national and international clearinghouse for the exchange of information on crime and criminal justice related matters.

The Institute's key operating assumption is that research and the knowledge it produces can and must have relevance to criminal justice policy. Because crime affects almost all of our public institutions and the private sector as well, it affects in some way almost all of us as citizens. The decisions made by criminal justice administrators and policymakers must be based on the best information that research can provide.

The research agenda of the National Institute of Justice emphasizes projects and programs that promise useful information for criminal justice operations. Policy-oriented research with practical benefits is given a high priority as well as new and improved approaches for State and local agencies to use in preventing and reducing crime.

In establishing its research agenda, the Institute actively seeks the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems facing the field and to assist in planning research that can help resolve them. The Institute welcomes the ideas of every segment of society and of our citizens in developing programs to control criminal behavior.

II. Programs of the National Institute of Justice

The programs of the National Institute of Justice are organized into three major categories that approximate the research, development, testing, evaluation, and dissemination process. They are: 1) crime control research, 2) crime prevention and criminal justice research, and 3) communications and research utilization.

This publication describes the solicited grant programs in crime control research and crime prevention and criminal justice research. Information on dissemination and research utilization activities is available from the Office of Communication and Research Utilization, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC 20531.

Crime Control Research

Significant changes in policy often occur on the basis of limited information, intuition, and personal beliefs. As a result, such changes can have unintended, sometimes counterproductive results. This program analyzes trends in crime and criminal justice and identifies critical issues that require sustained study and experimentation over a comparatively lengthier time frame than other problems. For example, a major and ongoing emphasis of the program is determining the deterrence effects of alternative sanctions and crime control efforts.

We currently spend $33 billion annually on a system designed to deter and punish offenders, and we need to know how effective the system is. The program also seeks to develop new tools to enhance the ability of research to provide more reliable answers to criminal justice problems.

Current methodologies are often insufficiently precise in measuring the effects of alternative crime control strategies. The program draws from all disciplines in refining research techniques so that the real effects of different sanctions and enforcement strategies can be determined.

Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Research

In an era of fiscal stringency, the productivity of the criminal justice system must be improved and innovative ways found to bring all the resources of the community to bear on the problem of crime. This program houses the Institute's applied and developmental research and evaluation activities. It supports applied research and evaluation directed specifically at improving day-to-day criminal justice operations through the study of current operational practices and the exploration of innovative concepts and policies. It also sponsors research and evaluation on how community and particularly private sector resources can assist in preventing and controlling criminal behavior.

The program focuses on research that is relevant to policymaking and on problems amenable to short- and intermediate-term solution. It is concerned with the practical operations of law enforcement agencies, components of the adjudication process (defense, prosecution, the judiciary), the correctional system, and with ways other sectors of society interact with the criminal justice system in controlling and dealing with criminal behavior.

Communication and Research Utilization

Research, no matter how successful, will have limited impact on policy and practice without intensive efforts to communicate research-based information to those who can put it to use.

The audiences for criminal justice research are varied--administrators and practitioners who operate components of the system, legislators and State and local officials who set policy, and researchers who are exploring various aspects of the field. Each has a different perspective and each is likely to obtain and use information in a different way.

The responsibility of this program is to establish linkages with these audiences and ensure that the results of research and evaluation undertaken by the Institute have an impact on criminal justice policy, procedure, and practice.

The program sponsors training, reference, publication, dissemination, and information services. It also maintains liaison with a variety of national and international agencies and organizations, public interest groups, criminal justice research and professional associations, and the private sector. The program establishes and maintains feedback mechanisms both to monitor the impact of research on policy and practice and to ensure that the research needs of the field are being met.

III. Research priorities

In establishing its research priorities the Institute attempts to bridge the gap between criminal justice theory and practice. It consults with criminal justice administrators in law enforcement, the courts, and corrections and with experts in the academic community.

As required by statute, the Institute maintains a balance between basic and applied research. However, all research is directed at improving the Nation's ability to control crime and criminal behavior. Differences in the types of research supported merely reflect the current level of knowledge available or the intractability of the problem under study.

The research agenda is particularly responsive to Task Force and commission reports on problems of concern to criminal justice and the public. The Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime, the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime, and the Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence each examined and documented problems of national concern and made recommendations both for action and for needed research and experimentation.

The Task Force Report on Violent Crime reaffirmed that the Federal Government has a unique responsibility to sponsor research on violent crime and to attempt to develop more effective methods to control its incidence. The Task Force Report on Victims of Crime documented the devastating losses suffered by victims at the hands of criminals and recommended ways that the criminal justice system could minimize these costs. The Task Force Report on Family Violence pointed out the harm victims incurred by members of their own families and called for an end to violence no matter where it occurs.

In addition to examining how research could contribute to these problems, the Institute also conducted a national needs assessment survey to identify the highest priority areas for management and operational improvements in the criminal justice system. The survey included six groups: judges and trial court administrators, corrections officials, public defenders, police, prosecutors, and probation/parole officials.

Meetings were again held in 1985 with the heads of practitioner organizations to identify additional problems in need of research and analysis. Among the organizations included in these meetings were:

International Association of Chiefs of Police
National Sheriffs' Association
National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives
Police Management Association
Police Executive Research Forum
Police Foundation
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Drug Enforcement Administration
American Bar Association
National Association of Attorneys General
National District Attorneys Association
National Center for State Courts
National Legal Aid and Defender Association
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
American Correctional Association
Bureau of Prisons
National Institute of Corrections
U.S. Parole Commission

The research recommendations and opportunities from all of these sources were reviewed by Institute staff and the following four priority areas for research established:

1. Controlling the Serious Offender. Violent crime, the crime that concerns the public the most, continues to occur at unacceptably high rates. This priority focuses on those who commit violent crime--specifically homicide, rape, assault, and robbery. It is concerned with the serious violent offender and his or her criminal career, the relationship of drugs and alcohol to criminal behavior, and the impact the criminal justice system has in deterring or creating disincentives for serious criminal behavior.

Finally, this priority also seeks to improve the ability of the criminal justice system to predict who is likely to persist in committing crime and to develop better classification systems for use in arrest, pretrial detention, sentencing, and dispositional decisions regarding such offenders.

2. Aiding the Victims of Crime. The report of the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime highlighted the growing dissatisfaction of victims with their treatment by the criminal justice system. The Task Force noted that victims have long been excluded from various stages in the adjudication process, although their involvement can contribute significantly not only to effective prosecution but also to the level of citizen satisfaction with the criminal justice process.

The Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence exposed another category of victims long ignored by both society and the criminal justice system. Spouse assault and child abuse were highlighted specifically as problems in need of immediate attention.

Projects under this priority will examine such issues as expanding the use of community and volunteer organizations to aid victims of crime, increasing criminal justice responsiveness to crime victims, involving the private sector and employers generally in reducing the burden of victim harm, and measuring and reducing the impact of victimization -- including victim compensation, restitution, and other programs.

3. Enhancing Community Crime Prevention. The most effective form of crime control is crime prevention. Research has pointed to the fact that citizens' fear of crime is influenced by several factors in addition to crime levels. These factors include neighborhood deterioration and public disorder. As a result, efforts such as those tested by the National Institute in Houston and Newark have been initiated to extend police-citizen cooperation beyond reporting crime to the maintenance of public order.

There is a growing realization that it is citizens themselves, in fact, who are ultimately responsible for establishing the "climate" of their neighborhoods, respect for law, and maintenance of order. It is this "climate" that is a fundamental form of crime prevention.

The focus of this priority is on crime prevention as effected through the involvement and activities of citizens, community groups, and the private sector. The latter can be particularly effective in enhancing the security of public areas to stimulate investment as well as making areas safe for employees and customers. Although the criminal justice system plays a critical role in stimulating and channeling the efforts of citizens and private organizations in crime prevention, it is the actions and response of the public that are the focus of research in this area.

4. Improving the Criminal Justice System. Enhancing both the effectiveness and efficiency of the criminal justice system are continuing and fundamental objectives of Institute research. The police, court, and correctional systems are continuously experimenting with strategies and techniques to improve their operations. Alternative forms of patrol, new relationships with the growing private security industry, automation, and new investigative techniques are being explored by law enforcement agencies. Traditional responses to spouse assault are being challenged.

The courts are experimenting with and examining new operational and management practices, new forms of punishment such as day fines and sentencing enhancements, and alternatives to traditional adjudication such as court-ordered arbitration and mediation programs and private mechanisms for handling disputes.

The correctional system, burdened by crowded prisons and court orders to improve conditions, is looking at private sector contracting for facility management and services, low-cost construction methods, and new forms of intensive supervision of offenders on probation or some form of community release.

All of these innovations need to be examined systematically to determine their effectiveness and their impact on other components of the criminal justice system.

The 1986 research plan for the National Institute of Justice consists of 14 program announcements. They directly address the priorities described above as well as other important research questions of interest to the Institute and the criminal justice community.

The program announcements in Section V of this document describe for each program the scope of interest of the research projects that will be considered for support and describe in greater detail some of the key issues that need to be examined.

IV. Application procedures

Proposals submitted to the National Institute of Justice should respond directly to one of the fourteen program announcements described in section V below. The Institute may publish additional specific solicitations during the year. These will be announced in the Federal Register and disseminated by the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), which may be reached by telephone at 800-851-3420 (in the Washington, D.C., area, 301-251-5500) and by mail at Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850.

Any proposals that are received unsolicited and do not respond to any particular Institute research program will be grouped and reviewed competitively on a periodic basis during the year. Such proposals will be funded subject to the availability of funds. The following procedures are applicable to all sponsored research unless otherwise specified in the program announcement or in a particular solicitation.

1. Eligibility: The Institute will award grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with academic institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profitmaking organizations that are willing to waive their fee. The Institute strongly encourages women, minority, and physically handicapped researchers to compete fully in any program described in this announcement.

2. Selection Process: Proposals will be rated by a peer review panel consisting of appropriately experienced researchers and criminal justice professionals. The panel will be chaired by the National Institute of Justice program manager. Review panels make their recommendations to the Institute Director, who has final authority to award grants.

The main points to be considered in the review process will be the content and clarity of information provided by applicants under the following criteria:

- Significance of the proposed research

To what extent would the results be expected to constitute an advance over the existing body of empirical and theoretical knowledge and to have relevance to the formulation of public policy in the area?

- Methodological considerations

Is the proposed approach technically sound? Are the strategies for the acquisition and analysis of relevant data both adequately defined and feasible?

- Candidate qualifications and management plan

Does the applicant demonstrate appropriate knowledge and ability to conduct the proposed work successfully? Are the sequences of activities, and amounts of time and resources proposed for each, reasonable? Where appropriate, have written assurances of the intent to participate in this project and cooperate with it from any necessary participants been included?

- Costs

Are the overall study and individual component costs for personnel, travel, data collection, and analysis appropriate to the project?

3. Proposal Format and Content: Applicants should submit eight (8) copies of their complete proposals by the deadline established for their particular research program. Submissions must include:

a. A completed and signed Federal Assistance application on Standard Form 424. A copy of this form is attached at the back of this announcement.

b. An abstract of the full proposal, not to exceed one page.

c. A program narrative which should consist of:

- A clear, concise statement of the issues surrounding the problem area and of the research hypotheses or questions to be explored. A discussion of the relationship of the proposed work to the existing literature also is expected.

- A clear statement of the project's objectives as well as its anticipated contribution to criminal justice policy, practice, theory, and/or research.

- A detailed statement of the proposed research design and analytical methodologies. Delineate carefully and completely the proposed data sources, data collection strategies, variables to be examined, and procedures of analysis to be employed.

- The organization and management plan to conduct the study. Include a list of major milestones of events, activities, and products and a timetable for completion, including the time commitments of key staff to individual project tasks.

d. Copies of vitae for the professional staff that summarize education, research experience, and bibliographic information related to the proposed work.

e. A budget outlining all direct and indirect costs for personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, subcontracts, and overhead, and a short narrative explanation of budgeted costs.

Applicants must also identify all other Federal sources of support, including the Institute programs to which this or a closely related proposal has been or will be submitted. Concurrent submission will not jeopardize the likelihood of an award.

Although there is no fixed limit to the number of pages in the program narrative, excessive length should be avoided. Detailed technical material that supports or supplements the description of the proposed research, but is not integral to it, should be relegated to an appendix.

Applicants should note the requirement that a copy of all machine-readable data sets generated in conjunction with Institute-supported research must be provided to the Institute at the end of the project period, along with code books and documentation.

Another condition of all Institute grants is the requirement upon completion of the project of a 2,500-word summary of the findings with particular emphasis on the implications of the study for criminal justice application. The summary is to be written in nontechnical language suitable for publication in magazines or journals directed at criminal justice policymakers.

All eight (8) copies of the proposal should be sent to:

(Name of the particular research program)
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

V. Program announcements

A. Serious offender

In order to develop more effective ways of controlling crime, we must discover how to influence the offender's decision to commit crime. To do so, we must understand more fully the range of motivations and factors that encourage the commission of crime. By focusing research on the serious offender, we hope to improve our ability to identify high-rate, violent offenders, to reduce their incentives to commit crime through effective deterrent policies, and to develop sanctions appropriate to their crimes and mindful of public safety. Toward that goal, the Institute has developed the following four research programs which examine different aspects of the serious offender:

1. Crime control theory and policy
2. Offender classification and prediction of criminal behavior
3. Violent criminal behavior
4. Drugs, alcohol, and crime

1. Crime control theory and policy

Introduction

The dramatic rise in the level of crime in American society during the 1960's and 1970's has stimulated an unprecedented level of public and professional concern about what official actions can be taken to cope with this problem. As recently as August 1984 a Roper survey found that crime and drugs were the most frequently mentioned societal problems facing the Nation--outdistancing inflation, unemployment, and nuclear disarmament.

The FBI crime reports for 1984 indicate that almost 12 million Index crimes were reported to the police. That year also saw the United States reach an all-time high in both the number of individuals imprisoned (463,866) and in the rate of imprisonment (188 per 100,000 population). The annual cost to the taxpayer for this level of imprisonment exceeds $7.5 billion.

The dilemma posed by simultaneously high levels of crime and imprisonment emphasizes what has always been a central policy question in criminal justice: "What is the effect of punishment on crime?" The idea that punishment (or the threat of punishment) will be effective in controlling criminal behavior is certainly one of the fundamental characteristics of any organized society. And governments, good and bad, have throughout history manipulated sanction schedules in an attempt to achieve a greater measure of social control.

In America today policymakers are devoting more attention than ever before to the specific issues of crime and punishment. Laws are passed that clearly aim at enhancing general deterrence through stiffer penalties for certain types of crimes. Police departments and prosecutors offices have established programs aimed directly at increasing the chances of incapacitating high-rate offenders during their most criminally active years.

But at the same time in many States there is an explicit concern about prison population sizes and prison costs. This raises questions about which criminals really must be imprisoned to give adequate protection to society. And this naturally leads to corollary questions regarding the crime control effectiveness of alternative punishments.

The broad mandate of this program is to support an accumulation of sound research on the crime control effectiveness of sanctions that would serve as a scientific basis for the continued evolution of an informed criminal justice policy. In this context, "sanctions" refers to those government actions that either impose or threaten to impose punishment for wrongdoing.

Scope

Public preferences in the past decade have shifted away from the ideal of rehabilitative treatment. Interestingly, this shift coincided with an emerging scientific consensus that acknowleged that most rehabilitation programs lacked scientifically compelling evidence of effectiveness.[1]

Furthermore, research advances of the past decade have generated evidence that crime rates are, in fact, responsive to more certain, more severe, and more swiftly imposed sanctions. In a comprehensive review of the literature, a panel of the National Academy of Sciences concluded that, in contrast to the beliefs of many criminologists of the 1950's and 1960's, the available scientific evidence "favors a proposition supporting deterrence more than it favors one asserting that deterrence is absent."[2] That study also found plausible the argument that substantial crime control effects might derive from the incarceration of active offenders.[3]

But scientific support for deterrence and incapacitation as mechanisms of crime control is still especially cautious about the size of the effects that can be achieved. For this reason, the Crime Control Theory and Policy Program is specifically designed to support research aimed at estimating the extent to which crime is (or could be) affected by alternative sanctioning policies.

Through this program, the National Institute of Justice is intent on finding answers to the pressing policy questions about how certain or how severe sanctions must be to affect the crime rate. Which types of behavior can more easily be prevented by which types of sanctions? At what times in the careers of which offenders will incarceration reduce the most crime? Can we predict which offenders will continue their careers unless incarcerated? Does the arrest of a friend or an acquaintance deter potential offenders? Are there classes of offenders for whom rehabilitation programs are demonstrably effective?

In response to these and other questions of public policy, the National Institute of Justice is soliciting proposals for research projects that will contribute to a better understanding of how well these policy mechanisms work. The following list of project classes, while not intended to be complete in its coverage, is intended to illustrate the scope and variety of the program's interests.

Policy experiments or quasi-experiments structured to obtain empirical evidence of the success or failure of innovative approaches to sanctioning. This approach was used to establish the deterrent effect of arrests on spouse assault cases in Minneapolis and to substantiate the effectiveness of the mandatory minimum firearm law in Massachusetts.

Criminal career research directed toward a thorough understanding of the onset, length, and nature of criminal careers. This sort of research seeks to determine the amount of crime prevented by incarceration and to obtain a better grasp on how incarceration retards or accelerates the development of offenders' subsequent criminal behavior.

Studies in this category have in the past estimated the annual crime commission rates of offenders and examined the age at which offenders first commit crimes, whether they specialize in one or several crime types, the duration of their criminal careers, the number of crimes committed during a career, and, most importantly for this program, the impact of incarceration or other sanctions on careers in crime.

National-level studies aimed at measuring the relative gains in crime reduction generated by the different levels of sanctions found in U.S. jurisdictions. This type of research has, for instance, analyzed crime and sanction data for a 30-year period using national level data. Investigations which systematically compared the experiences of State and local governments have been supported using data from the 1950, 1960, and 1970 censuses.

Policy analyses designed to simulate the likely effects of new and untried sanctioning approaches based on our present knowledge of criminal behavior and the criminal justice system. Hypothetical testing of the size of the incapacitation effects which can be expected from a policy of longer prison sentences for career criminals is an example of this line of research.

Perceptions research investigating why the assessment of sanction risk or sanction cost differs greatly among various subpopulations, whether these differences affect the propensity to engage in unlawful activity, and how the criminal justice system can communicate sanction threats more effectively. Past efforts have involved multiple interviews with adolescents to determine the sequencing of criminal behavior and perceptions of sanction risks.

Again, the above listing is intended to suggest the general nature of the program rather than to exclude classes of research projects not mentioned. The variety of crime types and research disciplines represented in this program should not obscure the highly focused program theme--the effects of official sanctions on crime.

Crime control effects derived from sources such as private protection or demographic variations are of interest to this program only insofar as they offer plausible and testable competing explanations for the observed reductions associated with official sanctions. Proposal authors should keep this objective in mind. All proposals should, therefore, describe clearly not only the research project for which funding is sought but also precisely how this research might benefit the continued development of criminal justice policy.

Deadlines and further information

Funding for this program has been tentatively set at $750,000. This amount would typically support about five to seven grants. Individual awards are normally limited to a maximum period of 2 years. Studies requiring more than 2 years to complete should be designed in phases. Selection of the first phase of a project, however, does not guarantee support for subsequent phases, and continuation award proposals must be submitted for competitive review.

Further, it is recognized that this program budget would not ordinarily be adequate for support of large-scale experimental projects or those requiring the collection of large amounts of original data. Limited funds could be provided, however, for design and feasibility studies for such projects. Again, program support for a design study would not imply an NIJ commitment of support for the follow-on project.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Crime Control Theory and Policy Program
National Institute of Justice
Room 900
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5:00 p.m. April 9, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Joel Garner, Program Manager, Crime Control Theory and Policy Program, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-7635.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Mr. Garner to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

1. Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies. D. Lipton, R. Martinson, and J. Wilks. New York, Praeger, 1975. Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders: Problems and Prospects. L. Sechrest, S. White, and E. Brown, eds. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences, 1979.

2. Deterrence and Incapacitation: Estimating the Effects of Criminal Sanctions on Crime Rates. Alfred Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, and Daniel Nagin, eds. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences, 1978: p. 7.

3. Deterrence and Incapacitation, p. 9. For a more recent review of the evidence concerning incapacitation, see "Incapacitation as a Strategy for Crime Control: Possibilities and Pitfalls." Jacqueline Cohen. In Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research 5, Michael Tonry and Norval Morris, eds. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983.

85-IJ-CX-0062 Participation in Illegal Behavior: An Experimental Assessment. University of Arizona.

84-IJ-CX-0071 A Longitudinal Analysis of Neighborhood Delinquency Rates. University of Oklahoma.

84-IJ-CX-0067 Effects of Sanctions on Prevalence and Incidence of Crime. Carnegie-Mellon University.

84-IJ-CX-0044 The Crime Control Effects of Sentencing Reforms. University of Maryland.

84-IJ-CX-0033 The Effects of Sanctions on Drunk Driving. University of California at Santa Barbara.

84-IJ-CX-0032 Arrests as Communications to Criminals. Decker and Associates.

84-IJ-CX-0028 Dynamic Models of Habitual Criminal Behavior. University of California at Santa Barbara.

2. Offender classification and prediction of criminal behavior

Introduction

Within recent years issues of offender classification and the prediction of future criminal behavior have achieved a new prominence in criminal justice policy debates. In particular:

- The concept of the career criminal has led to police and prosecutor programs that target resources on those offenders identified as the most persistent and most frequent in their commission of serious crimes. The logic, of course, is that the incarceration of such high-rate offenders could prevent a large number of crimes; and, indeed, in an idealized form a theory of "selective incapacitation" suggests the possibility of a simultaneous reduction in crime and in prison population levels.

In practice, of course, the success of such a policy must depend on the ability to make sufficiently reliable predictions about the future of individual criminal careers.

- Continued high levels of crime (and especially violent crime) coupled with a rather general loss of faith in rehabilitation as a universal basis for correctional policy has led to a wide variety of sentencing reforms. Partly because of the sheer volume of crime and partly because of changes in sentencing schedules, prison and jail populations have in many places reached crisis levels. Policymakers are searching for ways of reducing the number of persons who actually must be held under confinement without at the same time increasing the risk of victimization to society.

Prediction schemes and the underlying classification systems on which they are based are, of course, not new to criminal justice. Corrections researchers, for example, have worked for years to develop useable instruments for assessment of the risks an individual poses for disruptive behavior while in an institution or for the chances of a return to crime if released. And a formalized assessment of the "failure-to-appear" risk has in some jurisdictions been incorporated into the bail decision process.

Criminal justice officials each day must make thousands of dispositional decisions whose outcome is to some degree influenced by predictive factors. The priority objective of this program is to support the accumulation of a body of research that could inform those decisions by improving on the accuracy and reliability of the predictions that go into them.

Scope

The focus of this program is research to improve and facilitate dispositional decisions in criminal justice insofar as these decisions have a discretionary component that is at least in part influenced by an assessment of the risk an individual poses for some future behavior.

Obvious examples are the risk of new crimes being committed if a defendant is released pending trial or if a convicted offender is given probation. As

suggested above, however, real operational problems for the corrections system are involved in the evaluation of an individual's potential for violence and disruptive behavior while in custody, for attempting escape, for victimization by other inmates, or for attempts at suicide. And certainly the career criminal concept has profound significance for crime control policy if it can be demonstrated that the most frequent, persistent, and serious offenders can be reliably identified relatively early in their career.

There are a host of challenges facing the researcher. Typically, only limited data is available about an individual and some of that may be of questionable quality.

Indeed, criminological theory in its present state of development can offer only tentative guidance to suggest what the technically most powerful behavior predictors might be. Futhermore, the frequency of the behavior to be predicted is often not directly observable. And there are ethical issues regarding the use of status variables as criteria for dispositional decisions.

Other research issues are raised by the fact that the classification/prediction process must eventually be structured so that it can be administered easily by criminal justice officials and at relatively low cost.

This can impose rather severe constraints on the kinds of individual information that will in practice be available. But it also raises technical questions about the consistency and internal reliability of a classification process that must typically be administered as a routine operational procedure.

There exists a very substantial literature on the many research issues of concern here. Still particularly noteworthy are the discussions of Hood and Sparks in Key Issues in Criminology[1] and of Gibbons in his article "Offender Typologies--Two Decades Later."[2] Megargee and Bohn's treatise, "Classifying Criminal Offenders,"[3] while primarily devoted to the exposition of an MMPI-based system, also contains sections on the current state of the art and on potential directions for further research. Monahan's monograph, "The Clinical Prediction of Violent Behavior,"[4] examines in depth the problem of predictions of violence in individuals. Finally, a useful comparative evaluation of several widely known statistical prediction models is provided in "Screening for Risk"[5] by S.D. and D.M. Gottfredson.

The following list of topics represent in fairly broad terms the kinds of research projects that would readily fall within the scope of this program. Obviously, this listing is intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Development of improved analytic methods for classification or prediction of criminal behavior. Recent research has shown considerable interest in the adaptation of improved statistical tools and mathematical models for assessment of risks that are important in criminal justice decisions. The predictive power of any of these methods has yet to be demonstrated in thoroughgoing empirical tests.

This program has an interest in supporting further development of innovative methods. All applications must, however, include tests that would be indicative of the results that would be obtained if the methodology were routinely applied as a prediction device to inform criminal justice decisions.

Further development and testing of correctional classification systems. There are a variety of classification schemes being used by Federal and State prison systems. Some of them are based essentially on the expert opinion of experienced correctional administrators. Other, more elaborate systems find their theoretical roots and their long history of development in criminological applications of psychometric testing.

These latter systems especially were often developed for populations different from the ones to which they are now being applied (e.g., juvenile vs. adult offenders) or for correctional system objectives that are not at this time the paramount concern of correctional system management (e.g., identification of individual rehabilitation needs vs. the need to maintain order and control in a crowded institution.)

Additional research may be of help in revising and refining such classification systems through a thorough assessment of their ability to assign each individual to a unique subclass and the power of the resulting classification to assess risk potentials that are of major concern to correctional managers.

Criminal career forecasting. Over the past decade or so there has emerged a body of research literature that attempts to identify classes of offenders that are significantly different in their patterns and rates of offending and that tries to infer from the sequences of events in criminal histories what are the significant determinants of individual criminal career paths. The scientific goal and ultimately the policy significance of this line of research is obviously to achieve an accurate and precise probabilistic evaluation of how an offender's crime career is likely to continue to evolve, given what is known at a particular point about his past history of deviance.

Applicants who wish to pursue some aspect of this field of inquiry are again strongly encouraged to incorporate an empirical test of predictive power into their research design if this is at all possible.

Deadline and Further Information

Funding for this program has been tentatively set at $750,000. This amount would typically support about five to seven grants. Individual awards are normally limited to a maximum period of 2 years. Studies requiring more than 2 years to complete should be designed in phases.

Selection of the first phase of a project, however, does not guarantee support for subsequent phases; and continuation award proposals must be submitted for competitive review.

Further, it is recognized that this program budget would not ordinarily be adequate for support of large-scale experimental projects or those requiring the collection of large amounts of original data. Limited funds could be provided, however, for design and feasibility studies for such projects. Again, program support for a design study would not imply an Institute commitment of support for the follow-on project.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Offender Classification and Prediction of
Criminal Behavior Program
National Institute of Justice
Room 900
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m., March 26, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Dr. Richard Laymon, Program Manager, Offender Classification and Prediction of Criminal Behavior Program, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-7635.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Dr. Laymon to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

1. R. Hood and R. Sparks. Key Issues in Criminology. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

2. D.C. Gibbons. "Offender Typologies--Two Decades Later," British Journal of Criminology 15(2), 1975: 140-156.

3. E.I. Megargee and M.J. Bohn, Jr. Classifying Criminal Offenders. Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, Inc., 1979.

4. J. Monahan. The Clinical Prediction of Violent Behavior. Rockville, Maryland, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

5. S.D. Gottfredson and D.M. Gottfredson. Screening for Risk. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

85-IJ-CX-0019 Prediction and Typology Development. University of Iowa.

85-IJCX-0063 Psychological Classification of the Adult, Male Prison Inmate. University of Cincinnati.

85-IJ-CX-0072 Developmental Factors Associated With Sexual Dangerousness. Brandeis University and the Massachusetts Treatment Center at Bridgewater.

84-IJ-CX-0037 A New Methodology for Use in Assessing Parole Decisions and Mental Competency and Criminal Responsibility. Duke University.

84-IJ-CX-0017 A Base Expectancy Model for Forensic Release Decisions. Research Management Associates.

84-IJ-CX-0016 A Cross Validation and Test of the Generality of the MMPI Based Offender Classification System. Florida State University.

3. Violent criminal behavior

Introduction

> Every twenty-three minutes, someone is murdered. Every six minutes a woman is raped. While you read this statement, two people will be robbed in this country and two more will be shot, stabbed or beaten.[1]

Among the tasks set for government by the Nation's founding fathers were establishing justice and ensuring domestic tranquility. In many respects our history reflects the never-ending struggle that is necessary to make progress toward these goals.

For reasons that are not well understood, we have over the past generation seen a rise in the level of criminal violence that is unprecedented in our history and unparalleled among modern industrial nations of the free world.

Violent crime increasingly affects all of us. During 1984 a violent crime--a murder, a rape, a robbery, or an aggravated assault--occurred every 25 seconds. Indeed, homicide has become a leading cause of death among young black males.

These crimes not only bring suffering and hardship to the victims and their families, they affect the quality of life of everyone in our society. Public opinion polls have long shown citizens' grave concern about crime. Indeed, despite some encouraging evidence of recent decreases in crime rates, the latest polls still put crime at the top of the list of social problems in the minds of a large part of the public.

Scope

This solicitation seeks to focus the attention of the research community on one of the most distressing and perplexing issues presently facing our society.

We need a more thorough understanding of the factors that contribute significantly to serious, chronic, violent behavior in individuals. The accumulation of such knowledge cannot help but lead to a more informed and insightful public policy aimed at improved control over criminal violence. The following list of project areas, while not in-

tended to be complete in its coverage, illustrates the potential range of the program's interests.

Studies of incidence vs. prevalence of violent crime. The growth in rates of violent crime over the past few decades might hypothetically be "explained" in two rather different ways:

1. Violence has come to be accepted by an ever larger fraction of our society as a means of attaining personal goals. Thus, the increased rates of violent crime are substantially due to increased numbers of individuals who resort to violence at least once in their lives.

2. In relative terms, only a small fraction of the population ever commits a violent felony and this fraction has remained relatively constant over time. What has changed is the effectiveness of society's control over these individuals and especially its control over the persistent and frequent violent offender.

The reality, of course, might reasonably be expected to encompass both these phenomena to some degree. But heated public policy arguments very often do espouse just one or the other of these "explanations."

Research, therefore, might serve to clarify the policy arguments if it could shed more light on how much of the increased incidence of violent crime can be ascribed to an increase in the prevalence of violence in society as opposed to a reduced effectiveness in interrupting the careers of offenders whose crime portfolio includes a substantial rate of violent felonies.

Policy responses to violent crime. The high level of violent crime in the United States has prompted widespread public concern and calls for a more effective government response. In 1981, the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime issued its report containing 64 recommendations for improving society's response to violent crime. Since that time, most of their recommendation have been adopted, culminating with the passage of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984.

Similarly, at the State and local level, a great many legislative initiatives and new violent-crime control programs have been implemented as a means of stemming the growth of violence.

Research is needed to identify the more effective of these efforts. Researchers are encouraged to work with criminal justice agencies in devising new approaches to the control of violence and in evaluating the consequences of current programs.

Violent crime and mental disorder. Monahan and Steadman[2] have concluded that the correlates of crime among the mentally ill appear to be the same as the correlates of crime among any other group: age, gender, race, social class, and prior criminality. They state further that the correlates of mental disorder among criminal offenders appear to be the same as the correlates of mental illness among other populations: age, social class, and previous mental illness.

Collins and Schlenger[3] have concluded that the lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorder among male felons is much higher than that in the general population.

Brown and Courtless[4] found that the most frequent crime committed by the incarcerated retardate was criminal homicide, accounting for nearly two out of five of all offenders included in the sample. The issue of violence and mental disorder needs to be systematically investigated to clarify these conflicting reports and to develop information on which policy can be based.

Biological factors in violent crime. Wilson and Herrnstein[5] have completed a thorough interdisciplinary review of research on the full range of factors often associated with criminality. Their review points to the likelihood of biological predisposition toward some types of criminal behavior.

In the past decade a significant amount of criminological research has been concerned with correlating aggressive behavior with biological factors in many areas such as health indices, birth rates, birth casualty, neurology, learning disabilities, nutrition, endocrinology, and genetics. Although there has been some indication that biological factors are of more importance in violent than in property crime, this finding has not been entirely consistent.

Studies of domestic violence. Domestic violence is probably the most common violent crime. There are few reliable statistics available. Estimates of prevalence vary over a wide range, depending in part on how "domestic violence" is defined.

In addition to the immediate problems caused by abuse of family members, there is a strong conviction on the part of some researchers that children raised in violent homes grow up to be the abusers and the violent criminals of the next generation.

Ideas of parental rights and the sanctity of the family frequently stand in the way of research in this area. However, these are important issues and innovative approaches are needed to establish a firmer basis for knowledge and control.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been tentatively set at $750,000. This amount would typically support about five to seven grants. Individual awards are normally limited to a maximum period of 2 years. Studies requiring more than 2 years to complete should be designed in phases.

Selection of the first phase of the a project, however, does not guarantee support for subsequent phases, and continuation award proposals must be submitted for competitive review.

Further, it is recognized that this program budget would not ordinarily be adequate for support of

large-scale experimental projects or those requiring the collection of large amounts of original data. Limited funds could be provided, however, for design and feasibility studies for such projects. Again, program support for a design study would not imply an Institute commitment of support for the follow-on project.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Violent Criminal Behavior Program
National Institute of Justice
Room 900
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m., March 19, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Dr. Helen Erskine, Program Manager, Violent Criminal Behavior Program, at the above address, or contact her at 202-724-7631.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Dr. Helen Erskine to discuss it with her before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

1. Victims of Crime. Final Report of the President's Task Force on the Victims of Crime. December 1982.

2. J. Monahan and H. Steadman. "Crime and Mental Disorder: An Epidemiological Approach." In Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research 4, M. Tonry and N. Morris, eds. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983.

3. J. Collins and W. Schlenger. "Prevalence of Psychiatric Disorder Among Admissions to Prison." Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, November 1983.

4. B. Brown and T. Courtless. The Mentally Retarded Offender. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.

5. J.Q. Wilson and R.J. Herrnstein. Crime and Human Nature. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1985.

85-IJ-CX-0030 Justifiable and Criminal Homicide of Family Members, Acquaintances, and Strangers: Regional, Cultural, and Environmental Factors. University of New Hampshire.

85-IJ-CX-0033 Careers of Mentally Disordered Violent Offenders. State University of New York at Albany.

85-IJ-CX-0034 Biological and Environmental Factors in Violent Crime. University of Pennsylvania.

85-IJ-CX-0046 An 8-Year Followup of Formerly Incarcerated Violent Offenders. University of New York at New York.

4. Drugs, alcohol, and crime

Introduction

By almost any measure, drug and alcohol abuse and related criminal behaviors are among the most serious problems affecting America today. The social costs they impose on us all are tremendous, and the President has declared their reduction and elimination to be major national priorities.

Surveys reveal that distressingly high proportions of our youth use a variety of licit and illicit drugs, ranging from alcohol and marijuana to hallucinogens, narcotics, and cocaine. Alcohol abuse, as reflected in drunk-driving fatalities, is the Nation's number one killer of young people. Reports of drug abuse and related crime by prominent figures in fields ranging from sports to industry fill the media, and the nation's citizens consistently rank drugs and crime among their top concerns.

The annual costs to society of drug and alcohol-related problems are staggering--coming to $46.9 billion and $89.5 billion respectively. While one may argue about the accuracy with which such estimates are made, the problems are clearly of enormous social and economic significance.

Considerable evidence has shown the association of drug and alcohol abuse to many types of crime, from property offenses to crimes of violence. But our knowledge of the nature and magnitude of their contributions are still relatively crude. As a result, we have only limited abilities to estimate the potential effectiveness of alternative drug control strategies as crime control strategies or to assess the degree to which an individual's prior history of drug abuse can be regarded as predictive of his future criminal behavior.

Although recent studies have indicated that almost two-thirds of all prisoners in State facilities were under the influence of one or more illegal drugs when they committed the crimes for which they were incarcerated or had drunk very heavily just before the offense, we cannot readily determine the causal contributions (if any) these substances made to those crimes. It is difficult, therefore, to assess how many of those offenses would not have occurred if the offenders had not been using drugs or alcohol at the time.

We recognize, of course, that there are multiple and complex underlying mechanisms by which drugs and alcohol may interact with other factors to affect behavior. Drugs may act as both direct and indirect social, psychological, and pharmacological influences on the behaviors of substance-abusing offenders.

But they may also serve as powerful stimuli for criminal behavior even among those who do not use these drugs themselves--through the economic motivations involved in their production and distribution. Thus, to give a complete picture of the extent of mutual dependence between drugs and crime, research must encompass the criminality associated

both with drug consumption and with drug trafficking.

Scope

This program supports studies across the spectrum of relations of drugs and alcohol to crime. The scope of such studies may range from the development of relatively basic information on users and events through much more programmatically focused studies of interventions designed to deal with drug-based problems affecting society and the criminal justice system.

The focus of the Institute's interests, however, is on drug-related criminal behaviors, rather than on drug abuse per se or on such health-related aspects as the effectiveness of treatment or prevention efforts--unless these are also linked to better understanding of drug-crime relations.

In general, the research should be empirically and theoretically grounded, rather than simply descriptive. More specifically, researchers should address how the questions they will deal with may contribute to our understanding of the phenomena involved in ways that could relate to policies aimed at their prevention or control.

Within these broad outlines, some areas for potential research are indicated below. These are presented not as priorities by which candidate studies will be selected, but only as illustrative examples of the scope and variety of topics which have been identified as relevant to these interests.

Measuring how much crime is attributable to drug and alcohol abuse. Public policy largely rests on the belief that reduction of drug and alcohol abuse can (and will) reduce crimes associated with such abuse. Yet our present abilities to estimate (1) how many crimes of various types (e.g., violent, property, etc.) are attributable to drug or alcohol abuse, or (2) how much reduction in crime can be obtained with a given reduction in drug usage are relatively crude and inadequate to our needs.

To what extent can we improve our measures of drug-related crime and the impacts of drug trafficking on our society, either through more effective use of presently available databases or development of additional resources or approaches?

How much can we build on recent research on how drug usage affects specific offense incidents and criminal behavior patterns within offender groups over time so as to develop improved models capable of identifying and evaluating the crime-reduction yields of possible alternative policy options targeted at such groups as drug-using or drug-dealing youths and repeat offenders?

Patterns of drug/alcohol use and relations to development of patterns of delinquency and crime. An area of major interest for both basic and applied research is how (and why) patterns of drug and alcohol abuse progress and influence the onset and development of patterns of youthful delinquency and adult crime, either through intensification of prior patterns of deviance or initiation into additional behaviors.

Of equal theoretical and practical importance are how and why other individuals in "high risk" groups do not develop drug-related problems and how factors contributing to the cessation of previous drug and crime patterns can be identified and applied to criminal justice planning and control efforts.

Evaluations of policy options and programmatic effectiveness. Because of the dynamic nature of drug abuse and drug-related problems, public and private attempts at their prevention and control must be similarly dynamic. Innovations in State and local policies may reflect not only differences in the local character of drug/alcohol usage and related drug-crime patterns, but also differences in legislative or control strategy, resources, or other factors of potential interest and relevance to other jurisdictions faced with similar problems.

For example, a recent Institute study assessed how State and local policy changes toward incarcerating drunk drivers have impacted on DWI offenses and affected the operations of the courts and criminal justice system in several jurisdictions. Another Institute study is evaluating how urine testing of arrestees in two urban areas affects court decisions for pretrial release or detention and community risk of pretrial recidivism by drug-abusing offenders.

Assessing the relations of drug abuse and crime to other factors. The ability to assess accurately the size and nature of drug abuse trends is of fundamental importance to development of effective prevention and control policies.

Regional and local (as distinct from national) estimates of the numbers and characteristics of those currently using various illegal drugs are almost nonexistent. Yet these are the levels at which many political, social, and programmatic decisions are made affecting law enforcement, criminal sanctions, addict treatment, and drug abuse prevention efforts.

Cross-jurisdictional studies of factors affecting drug-crime relations and studies of time-related patterns of crime incidence in a jurisdiction as a function of other local explanatory variables must be built upon conceptually sound and reliable measures of both the crime and drug variables.

Improved methods for estimating the sizes and characteristics of State and local substance-abusing populations are essential. Changes in the drug scene bring new licit/illicit substances or forms into prominence (e.g., PCP and cocaine, "designer drugs").

As a result, patterns of production, price, and trafficking may change significantly, and user population characteristics (e.g., age, socioeconomic status) may also shift and necessitate changes in detection and population monitoring techniques from those based on narcotics-oriented models.

Costs of drug/alcohol abuse and related crime. While the costs that drug and alcohol abuse impose

on society are partly due to aspects related to their impacts on the health and productivity of users, there are also aspects which significantly differ from those--for example, costs associated with drug trafficking, related property and violent crime, and the efforts of communities, groups, and individuals to protect themselves.

Improved models of the full range of social and economic costs imposed by the direct and indirect effects of various types of drug and alcohol abuse would aid in the better understanding of their impacts, the projection and monitoring of their trends over time, and the assessment of efforts aimed at their reduction.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been tentatively set at $750,000. This amount would typically support about five to seven grants. Individual awards are normally limited to a maximum period of 2 years. Studies requiring more than 2 years to complete should be designed in phases.

Selection of the first phase of the a project, however, does not guarantee support for subsequent phases; and continuation award proposals must be submitted for competitive review.

Further, it is recognized that this program budget would not ordinarily be adequate for support of large-scale experimental projects or those requiring the collection of large amounts of original data. Limited funds could be provided, however, for design and feasibility studies for such projects. Again, program support for a design study would not imply an Institute commitment of support for the follow-on project.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Drugs and Crime Research Program
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m., April 2, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Dr. Bernard Gropper, Program Manager, Drugs and Crime Research Program, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-7631.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Dr. Gropper to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

J.C. Ball, J.W. Shaffer, and D.N. Nurco. "Day to Day Criminality of Heroin Addicts in Baltimore--A Study in the Continuity of Offense Rates." Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 1983, V.12, 119-142.

Prisoners and Alcohol. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. January 1983, NCJ 86223.

Prisoners and Drugs. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. March 1983, NCJ 87575.

J.J. Collins, Jr., ed. Drinking and Crime. New York, Guilford Press, 1981.

R.P. Gandossy, et al. Drugs and Crime: A Survey and Analysis of the Literature. National Institute of Justice, 1980.

B. Gropper. Probing the Links Between Drugs and Crime. Research in Brief, National Institute of Justice, February 1985.

B.J. Johnson, et al. Taking Care of Business: The Economics of Crime by Heroin Abusers. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, 1985.

Drug Use and Pretrial Crime in the District of Columbia. Research in Brief, National Institute of Justice, June 1984.

Jailing Drunk Drivers: Impact on the Criminal Justice System. Research in Brief, National Institute of Justice, November 1984.

85-IJ-CX-0023 Modeling the Crime Reduction Effects and Economic Benefits of Drug Abuse Treatment. Research Triangle Institute.

85-IJ-CX-0025 Drug Use as a Predictor of Behavior on Probation. Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

85-IJ-CX-0027 Retail-Level Heroin Enforcement and Property Crime. District Attorney's Office, Eastern District, Massachusetts.

85-IJ-CX-0052 Drug-Related Crime Analyses: Homicide. Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

85-IJ-CX-0056 Drug and Alcohol Use, Violent Delinquency, and Social Bonding: Implications for Intervention. URSA Institute.

85-IJ-CX-0057 Gang Involvement in Cocaine Rock Trafficking. University of Southern California--Social Science Research Institute.

85-IJ-CX-0058 High Level Drug Markets: An Economic Study. Rand Corp.

84-IJ-CX-0038 Narcotic Addiction and Crime: A Causal Analysis. University of California at Los Angeles.

B. Victims of crime

Introduction

Until recently, the concerns of victims have been largely ignored by the criminal justice system. However, reports of both the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime and the Attorney General's Task force on Family Violence stressed the importance of this problem, and the National Institute of Justice responded by sponsoring research that examined victim and witness experiences in dealing with crime and the criminal justice system.

This research has shown that the criminal justice system often places an unnecessary burden on victims and also denies them a meaningful role in its decisionmaking process. From studies on the criminal justice system's handling of rape victims to the National Judicial Conference on Victims of Crime, the Institute has helped the criminal justice system to seek ways of improving its treatment of victims.

More work is necessary, however, and there is a particular interest in learning how to make victim needs and concerns more central to the criminal justice system.

Institute research has discovered that crime victims frequently turn to friends, family, or neighbors for emotional and financial aid, often overwhelming them in the process. Restitution and victim compensation programs assist only a small portion of victims.

Funding for financial and mental health needs is now included in the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, and research will be required to better enable the system to identify victims most in need of such assistance and to insure that it is received.

In the area of family violence, Institute research has examined how the criminal justice system can make more evident the criminal nature of spouse abuse and improve society's response to this problem. It also demonstrated that arrest of the spouse abuser is a more effective police response than police counseling or temporary removal from the home--a finding that is already being widely adopted around the country. (See the research program on the Police Response to Spouse Assault on page 22.)

Institute research on the sexual abuse of children has also shown that most such cases result in no prosecution, and that sentences for pedophiles and incest offenders are almost uniformly light.

At the same time, efforts to minimize trauma for the child victim or witness during court proceedings raise due-process questions that must be addressed. Better estimates of the magnitude of this crime are required, and we need to know more about how best to deal with the offenders.

Findings from the Institute's victim-focused research have already been widely applied with considerable effect on our understanding of and response to the special needs of crime victims. The purpose of this solicitation is to build on and continue the progress made to date.

Scope

A wide range of topics pertaining to research on crime victims will be considered as appropriate for funding under this announcement. The following topic areas, although not intended to be complete in their coverage, are presented as examples of research subjects in which the Institute has a particular interest.

Legislation and other changes affecting victims. Many States have enacted victim's rights legislation or have in other ways implemented recommendations of the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime. A key research question is whether victims are treated significantly differently in such States and, if so, how these changes affect both victims and the criminal justice system.

The Institute is particularly interested in programs that give victims a more meaningful role in the criminal justice system process, with less Institute research emphasis directed at witness-management programs and other efforts intended to ease the burden on the victim or witness (day care, transportation, on-call systems, etc.).

Victim compensation programs appear to be utilized by eligible victims who are aware of them, but relatively few are aware of them. The requirements, operation, and utilization of these programs need to be examined. Key issues include costs and funding, restrictions on eligibility, methods of administration, promotional techniques if any, the extent to which the victim's losses are compensated, and evidence of impact on the victim's psychological and financial well-being.

The Victims of Crime Act of 1984 provides compensation for mental health counseling and care, but there is a need to learn what treatment approaches are most appropriate, how mental health providers can be made aware of these approaches, and the ways in which the full impact of victimization can be communicated to and taken into consideration by the criminal justice system.

Police assistance to victims. The police are usually the victim's first, and often only, contact with the criminal justice system. How well can the police empathize with and assist crime victims? How congruent are the perceptions of police and of victims concerning the seriousness of particular types of crime and the appropriate police response in each case? How far can the police realistically go in meeting the expectations of crime victims, and how short are they now of this standard? These are research questions that are also of special interest.

Family violence and child sex abuse. Highly accurate prevalence and incidence data for family

violence and child sex abuse are difficult to obtain and the Institute cannot support the establishment of large ongoing data bases. However, the analysis of data on these subjects is of interest, particularly if it can be accomplished at a reasonable cost. One example of the use of such data is the identification of factors that put a child at special risk of sexual abuse.

Studies of incest offenders and pedophiles are also needed to develop a more widely applicable understanding of these offenders, how best to deal with them, what sorts of treatment programs are effective in particular cases, and when long-term incarceration is the only safe way to deal with them.

The proper role of the criminal justice system in responding to child sexual abuse and wife battering needs to be better specified in terms of optimal collaboration with social service and treatment programs for victims and offenders.

Tracking cases between the criminal justice and service delivery systems, from first referral through resolution, can have important implications for victim protection and the processing of criminal offenders, and research in this area is also encouraged.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been set at a level of $1 million, which would typically support five to ten grants. These funds are not expected to support large scale experimental projects although consideration will be given to small feasibility studies involving the explanation and design of experimental efforts that might be carried out at a reasonable cost.

It is expected that once each year there will be a 2-day meeting of senior researchers on all projects being sponsored under this program. Dates and locations of these meetings remain to be decided.

All applicants should budget $1,000 for such meetings in each year or fraction during which the research is to be carried out. The explanation in the budget narrative should state that this is a "standard NIJ estimate to cover expenses of travel to the annual program conference, as directed in the program solicitation."

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Victims of Crime Research Program
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m. March 28, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Dr. Richard M. Titus, Program Manager, Victims of Crime Research Program at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-7684.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Dr. Titus to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

Recent related grants

Legislation and policy changes affecting victims

82-IJ-CX-0009 Criminal Justice Response to Victim Harm. INSLAW, Inc.

83-NI-AX-0007 Victim Appearance at Sentencing and Parole Hearings in California. McGeorge School of Law.

83-IJ-CX-0044 Crisis Counseling for Crime Victims. Victim Services Agency.

84-IJ-CX-0039 Psychological Impact of Crime. Medical University of South Carolina.

85-IJ-CX-0006 Sexual Assault Legislation. Center for Women Policy Studies.

85-IJ-CX-0020 Effects of Criminal Court Testimony on Child Sexual Assault Victims. University of Denver.

85-IJ-CX-0038 Criminal Victimization: The Physical Impact of Psychological Stress. Kent State University.

85-IJ-CX-0048 The Impact of Rape Reform Legislation. University of Nebraska.

86-IJ-CX-0001 Authorization and Implementation of Victim Impact Statements. SUNY at Albany.

Police assistance to victims

80-IJ-CX-0040 Specific Deterrence Effects of Arrest: A Field Experiment. Police Foundation.

85-IJ-CX-K035 Omaha Domestic Violence Experiment. Behavioral Research Institute.

85-IJ-CX-0069 Police and Civilian Help for Victims of Crime. Northwestern University.

Family violence and child sex abuse

84-IJ-CX-0074 Sentences for Sex Offenses Against Children and Adults. American Bar Association.

85-IJ-CX-0020 Effects of Criminal Court Testimony on Child Sexual Assault Victims. University of Denver.

85-IJ-CX-0066 The Impact of Courts on the Sexually Abused Child. University of North Carolina.

C. Crime prevention

Introduction

Until recently, maintenance of community security was almost an exclusive police responsibility. The escalation of crime during the 1960's and early 1970's, however, created a demand for a broad range of countermeasures and increased citizen participation in crime prevention. Police budget cutbacks and a growing awareness of this need for shared responsibilities also contributed to a strong community emphasis on the prevention and control of crime.

In support of these developments, the National Institute of Justice has been a prime sponsor of research in the area of crime prevention. Efforts have included studies of the crime prevention capabilities of individual citizens, neighborhood groups, commercial enterprises, and a wide range of private organizations, as well as studies of police security practices, police interactions with community groups, and special efforts to prevent specific types of crime.

Institute studies have shown that collective citizen actions as well as the physical features of a community can have important effects on both crime and the fear of crime. Experiments in Hartford, Portland, and other cities have demonstrated that combined citizen and environmental strategies can effectively increase safety and security in residential neighborhoods.

Other research has focused on preventing crime in commercial areas by suggesting preventive actions that the business community can take to increase commercial security. In addition, studies of mass media campaigns have identified effective dissemination techniques for promoting both crime prevention and improved crime reporting.

Police crime prevention activities have also benefited from Institute research. For example, studies of directed patrol, response to spouse assault, increased community interaction, and neighborhood team policing have helped to develop effective crime prevention techniques and have provided guidelines for their effective implementation.

Finally, research has also contributed to improved methods for preventing and handling a number of specific crimes, including homicide, rape, robbery, and both organized and white collar crime.

The purpose of the current solicitation is to generate research that will further advance our knowledge and help guide criminal justice practices and policies in crime prevention.

Scope

Research proposals that address the entire spectrum of crime prevention will be considered appropriate for funding under this solicitation. While the designs and specific focuses of these studies may vary, all proposals should be aimed at the development of more effective strategies for crime prevention and response.

Research may include activities undertaken by individual citizens; particular population subgroups, community groups and institutions; the private business sector; private security forces; and both governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

The following topic areas, while not intended to be complete in coverage, are presented to illustrate the range and variety of eligible research topics and to identify some issues of particular concern.

Partnership between police and the private sector. Public opinion surveys indicate that commercial and other private sector groups, as well as citizens in general, are becoming increasingly aware of their crime prevention responsibilities, no longer viewing crime control as solely a police function. At the same time, manpower and budget cutbacks in many cities are forcing police to reduce or curtail many of their traditional services and activities.

These conditions, along with experimental findings on the potential effectiveness of joint police-private sector crime prevention activities, have underscored the need for research to develop strategies, practices, and policies that can be most effective in achieving this partnership.

Studies might examine such issues as how police-private sector interaction can be increased and improved or how particular subgroups of the population, such as the private business community, might contribute more effectively to crime prevention efforts.

Neighborhood actions against crime and fear. Previous research has shown that the degree of physical deterioration and social disorder perceived in a neighborhood can have an important impact on its levels of crime and resident fear. These relationships need to be examined further and current strategies to address these problems need to be assessed.

The aim, of course, is to identify actions that can successfully halt this common pattern of neighborhood decline and disorder and its attendant problems of crime and fear.

Prevention of specific crimes. After escalating sharply in the 1960's and 1970's, the rates of serious crimes have remained high, causing severe physical, financial, and emotional harm to victims and creating a high level of public fear, especially among certain subgroups of the population.

Research is needed that will build on previous studies and contribute to the development of more effective legislative, criminal justice, and community or private sector strategies of crime prevention and response. Examples of specific crimes that merit priority attention include assaultive crimes, burglary, and white collar or organized crime.

All types of research designs and methodologies will be considered eligible under this program, including

field experiments, surveys, personal interviews, analysis of official records, and secondary data analysis.

Proposed methodologies will be judged on their soundness, feasibility, and appropriateness to the topic addressed. Special consideration will be given to experiments.

Deadlines and further information

Funding for this program has been set at a level of $1 million, which would typically support five to seven grants.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Crime Prevention Program
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m. May 16, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Lois F. Mock, Program Manager, Crime Prevention Program, at the above address, or contact her at 202-724-7684.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Ms. Mock to discuss it with her before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

Recent related grants

83-IJ-CX-0003 Experiments in Fear Reduction. Police Foundation.

83-IJ-CX-0012 A Study of Robbery-Murder and Robbery with Serious Victim Injury. Duke University.

84-IJ-CX-0059 Factors Distinguishing Successful from Unsuccessful Burglaries and Robberies. Research Foundation of SUNY at Albany.

84-IJ-CX-0023 Improving the Effectiveness and the Utilization of Neighborhood Watch Programs. Research Foundation of SUNY at Albany.

85-IJ-CX-0048 The Impact of Rape Reform Legislation. University of Nebraska at Omaha.

85-IJ-CX-0070 Downtown Safety, Security, and Economic Development Program: Phase IV. Regional Plan Association (NYC).

D. Criminal justice system

Society's ability to deal with crime is, in large measure, the result of how well the elements of its criminal justice system function. Research has demonstrated that when any one part of the system is unable to meet its demands, other components in the system suffer.

With the goal of presenting a potent, consolidated defense against crime, the Institute is encouraging research aimed at bolstering each segment of the criminal justice system and at improving the way the system operates as a whole. The following five programs make up the core of the Institute's criminal justice system research:

1. Police efficiency and effectiveness
2. Police response to spouse assault
3. Court effectiveness
4. Corrections
5. Improving the criminal justice system

1. Police efficiency and effectiveness

Introduction

With the creation of the National Institute of Justice in 1968, a great impetus was given to police research, the results of which have had major effects on almost all phases of police operations. The general goal of research supported by the National Institute of Justice has been the development and dissemination of knowledge that will enable police policymakers to make significant improvements in the overall effectiveness and efficiency of police services. Studies of subjects such as police response to citizen calls for service, directed patrol activities, alternate methods for handling service demand, prioritization of investigative resources, and crime/problem analysis have led to a reassessment of commonly accepted assumptions and have significantly altered many aspects of field operations.

The assumption that the police should immediately respond to all calls for service, for example, has been repudiated. In a series of related research reports, this traditional practice was shown to result in the ineffective use of resources. Findings resulting from these studies indicate that only 15 to 20 percent of requests for police service require rapid response. Moreover, other response methods, such as prioritization by seriousness, telephone reporting, and delayed contacts, were found to be logical response alternatives for particular calls.

Other research examined what happens after the police initially respond to a service request. Studies of the criminal investigation process, for example, found that the most important determinant of whether a case is solved is the information gathered by the immediately responding patrol officer.

Research also helped to identify key crime solvability factors which are now routinely employed by many departments in the prioritization and allocation of investigation resources.

Paralleling these key advancements in traditional police operations have been similar developments in areas heretofore less familiar to police departments.

Research on the application of computer technology in planning, for example, has led to computerized resource allocation models that are now extensively used by police departments throughout the Nation. And research currently underway in Newport News, Virginia, will demonstrate and assess new analysis techniques through the identification and resolution of key community crime and order maintenance problems.

Similarly, a recently completed report on special policing efforts in the business sector of Oakland, California, has demonstrated the benefit of law enforcement agency cooperation with the private sector.

By far the most significant research projects testing innovative alterations in the traditional police role are the experiments in various strategies aimed at the reduction of the fear of crime recently completed in Newark, New Jersey, and Houston, Texas. This array of experimental tests has provided a wealth of information on the feasibility of alternative means for police departments to address the interrelated problems of fear, community disorder, and police/neighborhood relations.

A projected continuation of both an unacceptably high rate of crime and an emphasis on tighter fiscal accountability in States and municipalities argues for a continued emphasis on improved productivity in policing. Many of the research themes mentioned above are still developing and are in need of further research and evaluation. Practical solutions to ongoing police problems are in high demand.

In order to help guide future developments and capitalize on previous progress, the National Institute of Justice is issuing this solicitation to encourage research that addresses key law enforcement issues and problems.

Scope

Achieving improvements in police practices requires a thorough understanding of law enforcement organizational goals as well as an appreciation of the methods, techniques, and operational practices employed to achieve these goals. It also requires the development and testing of alternative ways of organizing, managing, or conducting necessary police functions.

Proposed research projects should reflect this understanding. In addition, the likely continuation of State and local fiscal constraints, the need for improved police investigation and enforcement practices, and the continued expansion of the demand for general police services need to be taken into account in those research and development proposals submitted in response to this solicitation.

The following topic areas, although not intended to be complete in their coverage, are presented as examples of research subjects in which the Institute has a particular interest.

Proactive policing. By broadening crime analysis to include community/crime problem identification and the reduction of fear of crime, police resources may be more effectively used in conjunction with other public and private resources to change conditions necessary to reduce major criminal activities.

The trend of the police to view themselves as part of a broad community-based response to community problems, rather than as an isolated public agency that responds only to crime incidents, appears to be rather strong. If this tendency persists, new police organizational structures, policies, and techniques will be needed to support this change. Research to help identify these needs and responses is therefore encouraged.

Improving coordination with the private sector. With police budgets constantly under strain, close coordination with private sector crime control efforts should help increase effectiveness in both sectors, thereby providing improved service to the public. Questions regarding how these community resources are related and what specific roles police can play in stimulating, developing or coordinating such combined efforts, however, need to be addressed.

Of particular interest is the assessment of ongoing or experimental efforts in this area.

Police patrol. While directed patrol and crime analysis are identified as highly relevant elements of a modern police department, the results to date appear to fall short of what seems both desirable and possible. Many questions still persist regarding appropriate levels and forms of police patrol. The high cost and importance of this operation calls for further research with an emphasis on effectiveness and efficiency.

Criminal investigation. Although most serious crimes are reported to the police and investigated in an orthodox manner, many crimes, and especially those of the white collar variety, are hard to detect and even more difficult to investigate. For these cases, a more specialized police role is necessary. Staff skills such as accounting, tax law, data processing, and investment brokerage knowledge may have to be pooled to provide the expertise required to adequately pursue these cases.

Research that can contribute to improved investigative practices in these areas is of particular interest.

Police responses. With the emergence of differential management of calls for service, many relatively minor offenses receive little attention. What is lost by this approach? How might this problem be better handled?

Also, recent research has shown that 10 to 12 percent of police dispatches on patrol are for false burglar alarms. Is there a solution to this growing problem? Can these and other repeat calls for service be handled by alternative methods in order to reduce the service load on patrol? Are there linkages between repeat calls and other neighborhood and community problems?

Research that addresses these questions is also encouraged.

Forensics. In the last decade, the number of crime laboratories and related forensic services have more than doubled. Concomitantly, there has been considerable scientific advancement in the areas of analytical techniques and instrumentation. In order to maintain and enhance forensic capabilities, a better understanding is needed of the nature and peculiarities of the evidentiary materials with which the forensic system deals as well as the adaptation of available scientific advances to forensic requirements.

The Institute continues its interest in supporting research in the area of forensics and proposals that will advance forensics knowledge are strongly encouraged.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been set at a level of $1 million which would typically support five to ten grants. It is recognized that this program budget ordinarily would not be adequate for support of large scale experimental projects or those requiring the collection of large amounts of original data. Limited funds could be provided, however, for design and feasibility studies for such projects. Program support for a design study would not imply an Institute commitment of support for the follow-on project.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Research Program on Police Efficiency
and Effectiveness
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m. April 18, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to George Shollenberger, Program Manager, Police Efficiency and Effectiveness Program, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-2956.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Mr. Shollenberger to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

The projects listed below are recent examples of the type of research that has led to our current knowledge base. They should not be construed to be a limit or boundary of the research interests of the National Institute of Justice on this solicitation.

85-IJ-CX-0024 Computer Assisted Voice Identification System (CAVIS). Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

85-IJ-CX-0039 Evaluation of Police Field Training Officer Programs. Arlington County, Virginia.

85-IJ-CX-0053 Evaluation and Field Implementation of the Cognitive Interview for Enhancing Memory. University of California at Los Angeles.

84-IJ-CX-0010 Improving Eyewitness Reliability. University of Wisconsin.

84-IJ-CX-0040 Crime Analysis. Police Executive Research Forum.

83-IJ-CX-0003 Experiments in Fear Reduction. Police Foundation.

83-IJ-CX-0052 Detection of Handguns. University of Tennessee.

83-IJ-CX-0065 Proactive Police Management. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

81-IJ-CX-K020 Evaluation of a Field Test of the Differential Police Response to Calls for Service. Research Management Associates.

2. Police response to spouse assault

Introduction

Law enforcement agencies are usually the first and often the only public agency called upon to intervene in violent disputes among family members. Emergency response systems, like 911, are the primary source of citizen requests for assistance.

While categorization of 911 calls by crime type is not consistent across jurisdictions, one systematic study summarizing over 26,000 calls for service in three large metropolitan police departments reported more calls for "domestic conflict" than for all types of violent crime combined (Scott 1981).

How the police respond in these situations is critical for the immediate needs of the victims and the long-term prospects for preventing repeated incidents. In a study of family homicides in Kansas City and Detroit, the police had previously been called to the scene at least once during the prior 2 years in 85 percent of the cases. In 50 percent of the cases, they had been called at least five times (Police Foundation 1977).

These findings are important because the police had at least one clear encounter with both the victim and the murderer in a large proportion of domestic homicides, and they had at least five opportunities to prevent future violence in over half of these deaths.

But what the police should do when they arrive at the scene of a domestic disturbance is a matter of some controversy.

They can intervene between the two parties, restore some semblance of order and leave. They can temporarily separate the disputants, ordering one of the parties to leave the premises for several hours. They can transport one of the parties to the home of a relative or friend, or to a hospital or a shelter. Or they can arrest one or both of the disputants (Parnas 1967).

As in most controversies, the debate is not over what to do in extreme situations. There is little conflict over what the police should do when dispatched to a location where adults from the same household had caused a disturbance by loud shouting and arguing, or at the other extreme, where an assault with severe bodily injury had occurred.

The controversy centers on the appropriate police action in that middle range of intrafamily conflict where the police have the greatest amount of discretion and the least amount of guidance: those situations where enough legal evidence exists to authorize an arrest for assault but not enough to require an arrest.[1]

Traditionally, the police response to domestic disturbance calls has been to provide a temporary, order maintenance function (Wilson 1968, Reiss 1971). In many departments, the accepted practice has been for domestic disturbance calls to be screened by the emergency response operators and a large proportion of the callers referred to a social service agency.

When dispatched, police frequently limited their action to restoring order and separating the parties. Family disputes are considered social work and generally not considered susceptible to effective police intervention. Arrests are not recommended except as a last resort (Katzenbach 1967, FBI 1985).

In the late 1960's and early 1970's the police were urged to become more active in these disputes. Some reformers trained in psychology recommended that the police spend 15 to 30 minutes counseling both parties as part of an effort to reconcile the underlying differences that led to the dispute in the first place (Bard 1970).

The popularity of this idea led to large numbers of police officers being given some training in mediation and family counseling techniques. As late as 1984 mediation was the preferred policy of 38 percent[2] of the large urban police departments in the United States (Sherman and Hamilton 1984).

Objections to the policies of separation and mediation rose to prominence in the 1970's among groups concerned with the safety and protection of crime victims and, in particular, the rights of female victims. (Martin 1976, Walker 1979) They advocated a more traditional role for the police: arrest the attacker and empower the victim with the legal protection and moral authority of the state.

The relationship between the disputants, they argued, was not material to the police response. Indeed, a recent Federal court ruling (Thurman v. City of Torrington 1984) has allowed a suit against the police for failure to make arrests in situations where subsequent violence occurred.

Each of these responses to spouse assault--separate, advise, or arrest--had many advocates, but there was virtually no systematic evidence about the effects of any of these alternative policies on the victim or on the attacker.

Descriptive research about these cases made it clear that arrest rarely leads to prosecution (Lerman 1981b). Whether this is caused by a lack of continuing interest on the part of the victim or on the part of the criminal justice system, however, remains uncertain. There is additional evidence that many victims and attackers continued their relationship after an assault (Walker 1979, Police Foundation, 1977).

In some cities, the police encounter a high frequency of repeat calls to the same location for disputes between the same individuals (Pierce et al. 1985), although it is unclear whether information about repeat calls to a specific location is available to police officers when they are dispatched.

Until recently, the only direct evidence of the effectiveness of alternative police responses found no difference in the frequency of spouse assaults in one precinct after the introduction of a police family crisis intervention training program (Bard 1970).

Not until 1983 did the police have any direct evidence of the effect of their behavior on the victims of spouse assault (New York Times 1983). In a controlled experiment, the Minneapolis Police Department systematically varied the delivery of three treatments--advise, separate, or arrest. At the end of 6 months, both victim interviews and offender police records revealed substantially fewer repeat incidents among those cases where the police had made an arrest (Sherman and Berk 1984a and 1984b).

These results have dramatically influenced the nature of the debate concerning the appropriate police response to handling spouse assault. Although cautioning against unwarranted generalization of the result of a single experiment, the authors (and many others) concluded that the weight of the available evidence favors a presumption of arrest as the most effective police option in these situations (Sherman and Berk 1984a, Hart et al. 1984).

The available evidence on the relative effectiveness of arrest in reducing repeat violence remains limited and tentative.[3] The rigor of the Minneapolis experiment is exemplary, and the size of the effects substantial; still, the need to replicate the experiment in other jurisdictions is unquestioned.

Policymaking in this area is best served by a series of research efforts each contributing some independent evidence of the conditions under which various police responses to spouse abuse are most effective.

Scope

The National Institute of Justice is soliciting research proposals from interested parties to build upon the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment test of alternative police responses to spouse abuse. This solicitation will support several awards as part of a program of field experiments designed to increase our knowledge of how police interventions can work to deter subsequent violence among spouses.

The research supported under this program must implement an experimental design to test the effect of alternative police responses on the incidence and severity of repeated spouse assault.[4] Arrest must be one of the responses being tested.

The details of the experimental design, the hypotheses to be tested, the data analysis procedures employed, and the definition of the alternative police responses are left to the ingenuity of the applicants.

Research designs should be well grounded in theories of deterrence, family violence, police behavior, and conflict resolution, and researchers should be thoroughly familiar with social conditions and current police practices of the proposed research sites.

Cooperation between patrol officers and researchers is essential for the successful implementation of these experiments, and applicants should be as explicit as possible about how the necessary mix of skills will be brought to bear in the proposed research.

No one project is expected to address all the important research and policy questions currently impeding the adoption of more effective police responses to domestic violence. The central issue in each project must be the specific deterrence associated with arrest for assault.

Each applicant, however, is expected to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by local conditions to concentrate on one or more additional issues, the resolution of which will advance our ability to reduce family violence.

Note: This program was previously announced and published as a separate solicitation, Replicating An Experiment in Specific Deterrence: Alternative Police Responses to Spouse Assault. Copies of this more extensive program description are available from NCJRS.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been tentatively set at $750,000. It is anticipated that up to four awards will be made as the result of this competition. Institute policy limits all awards to efforts requiring 2 years or less.

Efforts requiring more than $300,000 or more than 2 years to complete should be designed in phases. In that case, the program narrative submitted in response to this solicitation should describe the com-

plete research project, but the sequence of project activities should establish clearly which activities will and which will not be accomplished under an initial award.

Funding of the first phase of a project, however, does not guarantee support for subsequent phases. Continuation awards will depend heavily upon the successful implementation of the initial phase. Proposals for subsequent funding will be reviewed by the Program Review Team, prior to formal consideration by the National Institute of Justice.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

The Police Responses to Spouse Assault Program
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m. March 4, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Joel Garner, Program Manager, Police Responses to Spouse Assault Program, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-7635.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Mr. Garner to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

Notes

1. What constitutes sufficient evidence for an arrest for misdemeanant assault, of course, varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction (see Lerman 1981a).

2. Fifty percent of the departments had no policy; in 10 percent, arrest was the preferred policy.

3. Some nonexperimental evidence from Santa Barbara supports the effectiveness of arrest in reducing subsequent violence between spouses (Berk and Newton 1985).

4. This program defines "spouse" to include conjugal or cohabiting mates as well as legally married partners.

References

Bard, Morton (1970). Training Police As Specialists in Family Crisis Intervention. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Berk, Richard, and Phyllis Newton (1985). "Does Arrest Really Reduce Wife Battery," American Sociological Review, 50, 2 (April): 253-262.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (1985). Crime in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Hart, William, et al. (1984). Final Report of the Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Katzenbach, Nicholas (1967). Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Klaus, Patsy, and Michael Rand (1984). Family Violence, Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Lerman, Lisa (1981a). "State Legislation on Domestic Violence." Response, 4, 7: 1-18.

_____ (1981b). "Criminal Prosecution of the Wife Beaters." Response, 4, 3: 1-19.

Martin, Del (1976). Battered Wives. San Francisco: Glide.

New York Times (1983). "Domestic Violence: Study Favors Arrest," Science Times Section, p. L1 (April 5).

Parnas, Raymond (1967). "The Police Response to Domestic Violence," Wisconsin Law Review: 914.

Pierce, Glenn, et al. (1985). Character of Police Work: Implications for the Delivery of Services. Boston: Northeastern University.

Police Foundation (1977). Domestic Violence and the Police. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr. (1971). Police and the Public. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, Eric (1981). Calls for Service: Citizen Demand and Initial Police Response. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Sherman, Lawrence, and Richard Berk (1984a). Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

_____ (1984b). "Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault." American Sociological Review, 49, 2 (April): 261-272.

Sherman, Lawrence, and Earl Hamilton (1984). "Impact of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment: Wave I Findings." Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Straus, Murray, Richard Gelles, and Suzanne Steinmetz (1980). Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Garden City: Doubleday.

Thurman v. City of Torrington, 595 F. supp. 1521 (D. Conn. 1984).

Walker, Lenore (1979). Battered Women. New York: Harper Colophon.

Wilson, James Q. (1968). Varieties of Police Behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

3. Court effectiveness

Introduction

The courts are an essential institution in our society, providing a formal decisionmaking process for determining the guilt or innocence of defendants charged with violating the law, as well as a forum for the resolution of a variety of civil disputes. In both situations the goal is a decision which is fair, unbiased, and just.

Developing information that can be useful to the courts in their efforts to provide swift and impartial justice has been a longstanding goal of the National Institute of Justice research program. A recently published compendium of Institute-sponsored research titled Improving the Adjudication Process, summarizes 15 years of Institute research efforts directed at providing assistance to the courts.

A major focal point of the National Institute's adjudication research program has been the pervasive problem of court delay. From studies of early delay experiments to current efforts to evaluate an innovative program using financial incentives, the Institute has sought to provide information that can help court administrators and judges deal more effectively with increased caseloads.

A further example is a current Institute assessment of volunteer lawyers sitting as judges to supplement available resources and to help expedite civil, criminal, and domestic relations cases. The focus here is on various means of providing low-cost and feasible options for courts to consider as management tools.

Institute sentencing research has also made significant contributions to increased efficiency and equity in the judicial process. Judicial guidelines for sentencing, which now serve as the basis for the sentencing systems used in many States, were initially developed and tested through Institute-sponsored research.

Furthermore, the same principles were applied in addressing the bail process. After successfully developing bail guidelines in Philadelphia, researchers are now expanding the initial experimental effort to include Miami, Boston, and Phoenix.

Another area where the National Institute has made a major contribution is in the development of alternatives to the court in the dispute resolution process. Evaluations of early Neighborhood Justice Centers demonstrated the benefits of using trained community volunteers as mediators and have led to the adoption of these types of programs in dozens of other cities.

Followup Institute research is also evaluating related "Multi-Door Courthouse" experiments that provide a wide range of dispute resolution services including adjudication, mediation, arbitration, and referral to counselors or specialized treatment programs.

Despite these advances, a host of serious problems continues to plague our courts today. For example, although effective methods of delay reduction have been identified, only some courts are attempting to use them. And knowledge about improved case management has often not been effectively applied.

Courts also need help in identifying and more effectively handling defendants considered to be dangerous as well as developing more innovative sentencing alternatives. In addition, more attention needs to be given to assessing the relative effectiveness of various alternative dispute resolution processes.

These and other related court issues can benefit directly from well developed research studies.

Scope

In order to address critical issues facing the courts, the National Institute of Justice is issuing this request for proposals. Studies are encouraged that address the following subject areas: 1) court operations and the adjudication process, 2) sentencing, or 3) alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.

Projects funded may involve the analysis and assessment of current practices or the evaluation of new court programs or procedures. The primary focus should be on criminal justice issues, but civil justice issues can be studied if a clear and direct relationship to criminal justice is established.

Proposed research should be grounded in current theory and practice while being responsive to the needs of the practitioner. Creative experimental research efforts are encouraged and will receive special consideration. Innovative field experiments, however, will require the identification of cooperative project sites as well as evidence of support from key criminal justice participants.

The application must address the significance of the problem and indicate how the results of the proposed research will contribute to improved policy and practice. Applicants are free to propose research on any issue they judge to be significant within the broad framework described above.

Some issues that could be addressed within the categories above are identified in the next paragraphs. These are offered as illustrations only, however, and are not intended to restrict or limit applicants.

Court operations and the adjudication process. The overall objective in this area is to improve court operations and increase efficiency. Topic areas that are of particular interest include:

- Technical innovations and case processing strategies designed to reduce court costs or delay.
- Fourth and fifth amendment issues, including the impact of Miranda warnings and various search and seizure procedures.

- Methods for maximizing judicial performance.

- Methods of identifying and controlling dangerous defendants before trial.

- Improved jury practices, including expedited voir dire, and the implemention of more useful jury instructions.

- Incentives for establishing and maintaining effective innovations in the courts.

Sentencing. Research in this area should examine the range of options available for sanctioning offenders and the effects of the various sanctions on subsequent offender behavior. Some areas of particular interest include:

- Experimental evaluations of the increased use of fines and cost-effective fine-collection mechanisms or experiments with special types of fines such as those based on individual offender incomes.

- Assessment of various sanctions and specific administrative procedures to deal more effectively with the control of drunk driving.

- Natural experiments to study the effects of changes in sentencing laws, policies or practices. These include recent changes in sentencing policies such as the adoption of determinate sentencing laws, mandatory-minimum laws, sentencing guidelines, the abolition of parole boards, and promulgation of new administrative policies by parole authorities, prosecutors, and corrections officials.

Alternatives to traditional adjudication. In order to direct the resolution of cases to the most appropriate forum and to reduce exclusive reliance on traditional case processing in the courts, a variety of court-related and non-court-related mechanisms have been established. The objective of research in this area is to determine the the relative effectiveness of these various alternatives to traditional adjudication, including the impact on resources and processes within the criminal justice system.

The following are some areas of particular interest:

- Assessment of court-ordered arbitration and mediation programs as well as other dispute resolution procedures.

- Evaluation of the growing number of innovative private sector mechanisms for handling disputes.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been set at a level of $1 million. From five to 10 grants are expected to be awarded under this program, with individual projects extending from 15 to 30 months each. The use of advisory committees is encouraged, with final composition of such groups subject to approval by the Institute Director.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Research Program on the Courts
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m. May 2, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Bernard Auchter, Program Manager, Research Program on the Courts, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-7684.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Mr. Auchter to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

83-IJ-CX-0008 Public Danger as a Criterion in Pretrial Release Decisions. Toborg Associates, Inc.

83-IJ-CX-0021 The Use of Volunteer Lawyers to Supplement Judicial Resources. National Center for State Courts.

83-IJ-CX-0039 Assessment of the Dispute Intake and Referral Centers. American Bar Association.

84-IJ-CX-0012 Fines as an Alternative to Incarceration: The Attitude and Practices of Trial Court Judges. University of Connecticut.

84-IJ-CX-0056 Assessing the Utility of Bail Guidelines. Temple University.

84-IJ-CX-0069 Budgetary Incentives and Reducing Delay in the Criminal Courts. Research Foundation of the State University of New York.

84-IJ-CX-0077 Implementation of Delay Reduction Programs in Urban Trial Courts. National Center for State Courts.

85-IJ-CX-0005 The Effects of Sentences on Subsequent Criminal Behavior. New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts.

85-IJ-CX-0044 Reducing Trial Time. National Center for State Courts.

85-IJ-CX-0045 Econometric Analysis of State Court Delay. Court Studies, Inc.

85-IJ-CX-0051 Alternative Procedures for Reducing Delay in Criminal Appeals. Justice Resources.

85-IJ-CX-0054 Evaluation of the Minnesota Determinate Sentencing System. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

4. Corrections

Introduction

A recent national survey of criminal justice administrators and practitioners found that today's most serious criminal justice problem is prison and jail crowding.

Between 1979 and 1984, the number of persons incarcerated in State and Federal correctional facilities increased about 50 percent, from 314,457 to 463,858. And this growth continues, with another 5 percent increase reported for the first 6 months of 1985.

The large number of prisoners and the lack of adequate correctional facilities have created major problems in almost all areas of the country, raising a number of issues that need to be examined carefully. These include correctional management and security concerns, the effectiveness of prison programs, and the emerging role of the private sector in the operation of correctional programs and facilities.

In addition, improved methods for incapacitating and punishing the more serious offenders in a prison setting as well as more effectively controlling the less serious offenders in the community are matters of particular interest and concern.

The National Institute of Justice has previously conducted research on a number of these topics, including jail crowding, improved management options for prison and jail administrators, and the nature and extent of private sector involvement in prison operations. In addition, special attention has been given to the effectiveness of probation as a means of handling selected adult felons.

Findings from a California study, for example, revealed that felons granted probation in two major urban areas presented a serious threat to public safety. During a 40-month followup period, 65 percent of the probationers were rearrested, 51 percent were reconvicted, and 34 percent were incarcerated.

These results underscore the need to further examine the effectiveness of community offender control programs, especially those providing intensive surveillance. Although intensive supervision programs in New Jersey, Georgia, and Massachusetts are currently being evaluated and attention is being given to the use of newly developed electronic monitoring devices, more work is required to address these and other pressing correctional problems.

Scope

This solicitation encourages research proposals that will produce knowledge and information that legislators, correctional administrators, and practitioners can use to achieve their correctional goals. Major topic areas covered by this solicitation and some examples of key research issues are outlined below.

While a variety of methodological approaches to these issues may be appropriate, special consideration will be given to experimental studies that allow careful and systematic assessments of specific correctional programs, policies, or intervention strategies. The following topic areas, while not intended to be complete in coverage, are presented to illustrate the range and variety of eligible research topics and to identify some issues of particular concern.

The privatization of corrections. A shortage of facilities, the time required to construct new housing, and the high costs of both constructing and operating institutions have generated increased interest in the involvement of the private sector in the field of corrections.

A number of issues merit special attention, including the appropriate role of the private sector in these operations, mechanisms for determining when and where private sector involvement is most appropriate and cost effective, the question of liability, and the assessment of specific private sector correctional experiences. Research studies that address the above issues are particularly encouraged.

Control of offenders in the community. The achievement of such correctional goals as incapacitation, deterrence, punishment, and protection of the community involve the institutionalization of large numbers of offenders. For some selected offenders, however, many of these goals may be accomplished at much less cost in the community.

In order to adequately protect the community, however, more effective mechanisms are needed to identify both pretrial defendants and convicted offenders who can be safely monitored in the community. There is also a need to develop more effective strategies for actually controlling such offenders in the community and reducing their probability of recidivism.

There is a particular interest in experimental studies that deal with intensive probation, electronic monitoring, or other community surveillance and control programs.

Conditions of confinement. In many States, correctional systems are under court order either to reduce prison crowding or to revise various prison management policies and practices, such as those covering health and inmate control. Correctional administrators in these States have a pressing need for acceptable guidelines that better define appropriate prison conditions.

Empirical research that will aid in the determination of what constitutes effective and legally acceptable conditions of confinement is, therefore, also considered to constitute a special research need.

Effectiveness of prison programs. Jail and prison administrators must deal with a wide range of inmates and inmate needs in the management of their facilities. Of special concern is the increasing number of relatively long-term prisoners.

During fiscal year 1985, the National Institute undertook several projects to evaluate the effectiveness of efforts to reduce institutional violence, especially among long-term offenders and prison gang members. While these projects are addressing particular approaches to the problem, other strategies which might be useful in dealing with these and other target groups need to be examined.

Research is also needed to assess the effectiveness of various prison programs and prison management techniques. Prior research has questioned the effectiveness of many prison programs but it has also indicated that certain programs, such as those dealing with problems of alcohol or drug abuse, may be effective with particular types of offenders.

Research that better identifies what types of inmates benefit more from specific prison programs is of particular interest. Additional information is needed about the effectiveness of programs that can serve to reduce substance abuse, improve educational levels, and increase the employability of offenders.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been set at a level of $1 million. From five to ten grants are expected to be awarded under this program, with individual projects extending from 15 to 30 months each. The use of advisory committees is encouraged, with the final composition of such groups subject to approval by the Institute Director.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Research Program on Corrections
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5 p.m., April 25, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Annesley K. Schmidt, Program Manager, Research Program on Corrections, at the above address, or contact her at 202-724-2959.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Ms. Schmidt to discuss it with her before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

References and recent related grants

83-IJ-CX-0002 An Analysis of Who Receives Probation. Rand Corporation.

83-IJ-CX-K027 Controlling Offenders in the Community. Rutgers University.

84-IJ-CX-0043 Improved Handling of Long-Term Offenders. Missouri Department of Corrections.

85-IJ-CX-0036 Impact of Intensive Probation Supervision in Masssachusetts. University of Massachusetts at Lowell.

85-IJ-CX-0043 Analysis and Management of Long-Term Offender Violence. Correctional Services Group.

85-IJ-CX-0049 Finding Effective Strategies to Control Gang Violence in Prison. Criminal Justice Institute.

85-IJ-CX-0060 Evaluation of an Interagency Vocational Rehabilitation Program for Youthful Offenders. North Carolina State University.

85-IJ-CX-0067 Electronic Monitoring of Offenders: An Appraisal. Michigan Department of Corrections.

5. The system of criminal justice

Introduction

> Police, court, and correction officials all share the objective of reducing crime. But each uses different, sometimes conflicting, methods and so focuses frequently on inconsistent subobjectives. The latent conflicts between the parts may not be apparent from the viewpoint of either subsystem, but there is an obvious need to balance and rationalize them so as to achieve optimum overall effectiveness.
>
> Task Force Report on Science and Technology, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1967.

The criminal justice system traditionally encompasses the many Federal, State, and local governmental organizations having some responsibility for the prevention, control, and alleviation of crime. However, there is also a host of private entities that have responsibilities and interests in these areas. This complex includes a wide assortment of agencies, community groups, and other organizations that expend a vast array of resources to combat crime.

Most research on the criminal justice system has dealt with various aspects of the major system components, i.e., police, courts, and corrections. It has attempted to gather and analyze data on these components to develop improved methods and techniques for overcoming perceived problems or enhancing specific functional capabilities.

There is little doubt that this increased knowledge has helped to improve overall criminal justice operations, but at the same time it is clear that some of the component policies, goals, and practices not only conflict with one another but cause dislocations in other parts of the system.

For example, new sentencing laws, policies, and pretrial release practices, although aiding certain parts of the system, may produce serious resource, safety, and coordination problems for other components.

Factors that tend to produce such disfunctions are the lack of common goals, the absence of effective coordination mechanisms, and a limitation in the de-

velopment and effective use of common information systems. A number of Institute-sponsored studies on police-prosecutor relations, for example, demonstrated the importance of these factors and the need to develop a more harmonized system of operations.

In spite of these problems and sporadic organizational conflicts, there are numerous examples of effective system coordination. Current efforts regarding the identification and apprehension of serial murderers, the publication and location of missing children, and regionalized narcotic and organized crime intelligence activities are but a few.

The criminal justice system and its varied components represent both a critical and an exceedingly complex range of activities, and the National Institute is interested in supporting research that will better describe and analyze interactions that affect the system as a whole. The aim is to identify improved policies and practices that will promote greater efficiency and effectiveness throughout the criminal justice system.

Scope

The requested research should focus on the relationships of the major parts of the system of criminal justice, with the aim of identifying significant conflicts, weaknesses, and problems relating to these relationships and analyzing their causes, results, and potential remedies.

There is a particular interest in means of dealing more effectively with dysfunctional aspects of the criminal justice system. System modeling or computer simulation efforts per se are not viewed as having a high priority, although it is recognized they may play an important role in an intensive analytical process.

What is of particular interest is the interaction among major system components in addressing such criminal justice functions as the identification, prosecution, and handling of serious repeat offenders, the need to better control offenders in the community, improved responses to victims, and joint efforts to carry out a variety of crime prevention activities. The ultimate research aim should be the identification of successful strategies and practices and the development of incentives and mechanisms for promoting more effective systemwide operations and procedures.

Special consideration will be given to the development and evaluation of experimental research. Proposals should build upon existing criminal justice system knowledge and strategies and must suggest how the research will expand and improve current policies and practices.

Although by no means limited to these topics, examples of research areas in which the Institute has a particular interest include:

Systemwide coordination and planning. Mechanisms for assuring systemwide coordination are urgently needed in most communities. Criminal justice coordinating councils have been employed as one means of addressing this problem, but the extent of their use is limited and more information is required regarding their potential effectiveness.

There is also a need to examine issues related to the development and implementation of systemwide goals and policies, particularly in regard to the establishment of local criminal justice priorities and associated practices. For that reason, research that focuses on specific system failures and successes as well as on programs, practices, and policies that help promote and maintain effective and efficient systemwide operations and planning is also encouraged.

Systemwide activities that impact on the public and victims of crime. Criminal justice activities that lack a systemwide focus may have an adverse impact on victims of crime as well as the general public. These effects can range from a lack of confidence in the ability of public agencies to adequately respond to crime and criminal offenders, to a reluctance to report crimes and to testify in criminal court, to dissatisfaction with the manner in which both the public and victims are treated when they try to obtain justice.

Many of these adverse system effects have been extensively documented in the President's Task Force Report on Victims of Crime and the Attorney General's Task Force Report on Family Violence. As these investigations have demonstrated, there is a need to show where, when, and why the system fails, the extent of its impact, and how the system can be improved to both anticipate and correct these deficiencies. Research that addresses these particular issues is, therefore, also encouraged.

Systemwide activities that adversely impact the handling of criminal defendants and offenders. There are many ways in which inadequate systemwide activities adversely impact efforts to identify, prosecute, and incapacitate serious criminal offenders.

Available evidence is often not properly collected or analyzed, there are inadequacies in the filing of criminal charges, key witnesses are not properly prepared or encouraged to appear at trial, inadequate case preparation and schedule conflicts may result in unnecessary case delays or dismissals, sentencing may occur before adequate offender background information is presented, and both defendants and the public conclude that the criminal justice process is ineffective.

These system failures can result in the release of a guilty offender or in unnecessary trauma to a crime victim. The failure of the system to provide a fair and just trial can lead to public mistrust and a decrease in the cooperation of victims and witnesses, thus leading to a further reduction in system effectiveness.

Research is needed to study ways in which the system can more effectively handle defendants and criminal offenders, and therefore this focus of study is also encouraged.

Deadline and further information

Funding for this program has been set at a level of $500,000, which would typically support four to six grants.

It is recognized that this program budget ordinarily would not be adequate for support of large-scale experimental projects or those requiring the collection of large amounts of original data. Limited funds could be provided, however, for design and feasibility studies for such projects. Program support for a design study would not imply an NIJ commitment of support for the follow-on project.

Eight (8) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Research Program on System of Criminal Justice
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5:00 P.M., March 14, 1986. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

To obtain further information about this solicitation, researchers may write to Joseph Kochanski, Program Manager, Research on the System of Criminal Justice, at the above address, or contact him at 202-724-2962.

Potential applicants who may want to clarify the appropriateness of a specific research idea for funding under this program are encouraged to call Mr. Kochanski to discuss it with him before undertaking the considerable effort required to prepare a proposal that would be competitive.

E. Fellowship programs

The Institute recognizes that alternatives to the traditional research project can contribute a great deal to improvements in the criminal justice system and advancements in the field of criminal justice research.

There is a need to encourage greater participation by criminal justice practitioners in the development and conduct of research. Bright, new researchers need to be encouraged to pursue criminal justice issues. Greater use of existing data resources can provide challenging short-term research opportunities.

To develop these promising research capabilities, the Institute is sponsoring the following three fellowship programs:

1. Visiting Fellowships
2. Graduate Research Fellowships
3. Summer Research Fellowships.

1. Visiting Fellowships

Introduction

The Visiting Fellowship Program sponsors research conducted by qualified scholars and criminal justice professionals. Its principal aim is to contribute to our understanding of crime and criminal behavior, the impacts of crime control policies, and the fairness, effectiveness, and efficiency of criminal justice system operations.

Selection is based on a competitive review of candidate proposals. Recipients are located at the National Institute of Justice, where they work on projects of their own design for periods of 6 to 18 months.

While at the Institute, Fellows also have the opportunity to participate in the development of plans for criminal justice research programs of national scope, interact with Institute staff and other Visiting Fellows, and present seminars on their own research.

The Visiting Fellowship Program has two components, differentiated by the background and orientation of the applicants. They are:

Fellowships for practitioners. These are geared to middle- and upper-level criminal justice personnel who are selected on the basis of their operational experience and their proposed research project. These people are usually employees of State or local governments. Their experience may be in police, courts, institutional corrections, probation and parole, community crime prevention, victim services, or any other aspect of criminal justice.

Fellowships for researchers. These are designed for individuals with broad and extensive criminal justice research experience who are selected on the basis of this experience and their proposed research.

Scope

The program is open to criminal justice practitioners and researchers. Awards are made to support projects that are of a research nature.

Action-oriented projects (such as those intended to provide training or treatment) in which research plays a minor role are outside the scope of Fellowship program support. Also ineligible are part-time research efforts, students seeking educational support for graduate or undergraduate work, and persons previously awarded Visiting Fellowships.

Fellows are expected to spend a minimum of 80 percent of their Fellowship period at the National Institute of Justice in Washington, D.C.

The Visiting Fellowship awards may be made in one of two ways. Awards under either the researcher or practitioner component of the program may be made in either way:

Grants to individuals. These provide salary and project costs. The allowable costs are described below in detail in the section entitled "Fellowship arrangements and support."

Intergovernmental personnel action (IPA). To be eligible for an IPA, the applicant must be an official or an employee of State and local government or an employee of nonprofit criminal justice organizations, provided the latter are certified by the Office of Personnel Management as eligible to participate under the provisions of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970, as amended (PL 91-648).

As applied in this program, an IPA appointment is basically an agreement between the National Institute of Justice and the Visiting Fellow's parent agency under which the appointee is detailed to NIJ for the 6-to-18-month Fellowship period. The National Institute agrees to reimburse the State or local agency for up to 100 percent of the Fellow's salary and fringe benefits, plus certain other costs necessitated by the move to Washington and by the nature of the research project to be undertaken while the Fellow is in residence at the Institute.

The parent agency essentially must agree to continue to pay the Fellow's salary and fringe benefits, plus those additional expenses authorized in the agreement, to provide the Institute with invoices of expenses incurred, and to offer continued employment upon completion of the Fellow's detail.

Deadline and further information

Project Schedule: Project periods can run from 6 to 18 months. Start dates are flexible, but all projects must begin between July 1, 1986, and June 30, 1987. Applicants should include a timetable indicating proposed start and end dates, along with a listing of major project tasks and an estimated schedule for their completion.

Location and Support: Fellows are located in Washington, D.C., at the National Institute of Justice during their Fellowship period, where they are provided phone usage, access to computer terminals and photocopiers (for normal day-to-day use), office furnishings, and office supplies. Other costs, such as postage, stationery, and clerical support are not chargeable to the Institute's operating budget and must be explicitly included as reimbursable items under the project budget.

Budgets should also include estimated costs of computer time on the system of the applicant's choice (including network costs for linking the terminal to the system).

Salary: The allowable Fellowship salary or stipend is determined on the basis of the applicant's earned income.

Fringe Benefits: The Institute will assume the cost of all fringe benefits presently provided by the employer, including pension fund and insurance plan in which the Fellow is enrolled at the time of award and plans to continue during the Fellowship period.

Relocation Expenses: Reasonable relocation costs are allowable under the award, and should be estimated and explained in the budget.

Travel: The costs of travel within the United States essential to the accomplishment of the project's goals are covered. Fellows may not be in travel status more than 20 percent of the project period.

Supplementary Expenses: Special equipment purchases or leases may be allowed if they are essential to the project. For example, leasing of word processing equipment would be allowed if the applicant's proposed project required particularly heavy use of such equipment for an extended period of time.

Applicants may also budget a reasonable total amount as planned compensation for consultants with whom they may need to confer in the course of their research. The individual daily rate of compensation for such consultant support may not exceed $150.

Funding: An allocation of $250,000 has been set for this program, which is expected to support up to a total of six fellowships--three for practitioners and three for researchers.

Deadline: Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5:00 p.m., March 14, 1986.

Contact: To obtain further information about this program, researchers may write to Joseph Kochanski, Program Manager, Visiting Fellowships Program, National Institute of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20531, or contact him at 202-724-2962.

2. Graduate Research Fellowships

Introduction

The Graduate Research Fellowship Program provides a limited number of Fellowships, which will be awarded to doctoral candidates through sponsoring universities, to support students engaged in the research and writing of a doctoral dissertation in the areas of crime, crime prevention, criminal behavior, or criminal justice. Prior to the grant award, applicants must have completed all degree requirements except for the research, writing, and defense of the dissertation, and, if required, an internship.

Scope

- The maximum amount of any one fellowship is $11,000.

- Fellowship awards are for one year or less. Time extensions may be granted for the delivery of the dissertation but no further funds will be awarded.

- To be eligible to administer a Graduate Research Fellowship grant on behalf of a doctoral candidate, an institution must be fully accredited by one of the regional institutional accrediting commissions recognized by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Deadline and further information

For 1986, a total of $150,000 has been allocated for this program and is expected to support 13 to 17 Fellowships. **Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice no later than 5:00 p.m., March 14, 1986.**

Specific requirements and program details are described in a separate announcement for the Graduate Research Fellowship Program. In order to obtain copies of this announcement write to: Announcement --Graduate Research Fellowships, National Institute of Justice/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850.

3. Summer Research Fellowships

Introduction

The National Institute of Justice is soliciting proposals for its 1986 Summer Research Fellowship Program. The program is specifically aimed at addressing criminal justice policy questions through the reanalysis of existing research data. The Institute has funded numerous research projects during the last 15 years. These projects have produced a wealth of original data. The reanalyses of these data are a thrifty way to gain additional insight on important crime and criminal justice policy issues.

The program is intended for senior researchers as well as relatively new Ph.D.'s. Applicants are expected to have strong quantitative skills and experience with machine-readable criminal justice data sets.

Scope

Approximately five awards of no more than $10,000 each will be awarded to individual researchers to address specific criminal justice policy questions. The selection of hypotheses to be investigated and the data appropriate to that task is left to the best judgment of the applicants.

The use of data sets generated with Institute support and released through the Criminal Justice Data Archive at the University of Michigan's Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research is encouraged. Information on these data sets is included in Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice. This publication is available from the National Institute of Justice/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850.

Studies based on other data sets will, of course, be considered for funding under this program. In this case, applicants need to make a special effort to describe in some detail the data to be used and to explain the appropriateness of that data for the proposed analyses.

Work should not begin before June 1, 1986, and final products are due no later than October 31, 1986.

Deadline and further information

Applicants should submit a proposal, not to exceed 10 double-spaced pages, that specifies 1) the policy question to be addressed, 2) the hypotheses to be investigated, 3) the data set(s) to be employed, 4) the nature of the data analyses to be performed, 5) the potential policy implications, and 6) expected products of the research. Applicants should include resumes for key project personnel and a brief description of the computing facilities available.

A detailed budget for salaries, supplies, computing costs, etc. must be provided. Applicants should include the cost of one trip to Atlanta, Georgia, to present the results of this research at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

This program is designed as summer support for individuals; the inclusion of institutional indirect costs is strongly discouraged.

Five copies of the project narrative, resumes, and budget must be received by the close of business April 2, 1986. Preliminary decisions will be made by May 1, 1986; formal awards will be negotiated by June 1, 1986.

For more information about this program, contact Ms. Winifred L. Reed, National Institute of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20531. Ms. Reed may be reached by telephone at 202-724-7636.

VI. Application forms

OMB Approval No. 0348-0006

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SECTION I—APPLICANT/RECIPIENT DATA

1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION (Mark appropriate box)
- ☐ NOTICE OF INTENT (OPTIONAL)
- ☐ PREAPPLICATION
- ☐ APPLICATION

2. APPLICANT'S APPLICATION IDENTIFIER
- a. NUMBER
- b. DATE (Year month day) 19

3. STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER (NOTE: TO BE ASSIGNED BY STATE)
- a. NUMBER
- b. DATE ASSIGNED (Year month day) 19

Leave Blank

4. LEGAL APPLICANT/RECIPIENT
- a. Applicant Name
- b. Organization Unit
- c. Street/P.O. Box
- d. City
- e. County
- f. State
- g. ZIP Code
- h. Contact Person (Name & Telephone No.)

5. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN)

6. PROGRAM (From CFDA)
- a. NUMBER
- MULTIPLE ☐
- b. TITLE

7. TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT (Use section IV of this form to provide a summary description of the project.)

8. TYPE OF APPLICANT/RECIPIENT
A—State; B—Interstate; C—Substate Organization; D—County; E—City; F—School District; G—Special Purpose District; H—Community Action Agency; I—Higher Educational Institution; J—Indian Tribe; K—Other (Specify):
Enter appropriate letter ☐

9. AREA OF PROJECT IMPACT (Names of cities, counties, states, etc.)

10. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS BENEFITING

11. TYPE OF ASSISTANCE
A—Basic Grant; B—Supplemental Grant; C—Loan; D—Insurance; E—Other
Enter appropriate letter(s) ☐☐

12. PROPOSED FUNDING

a. FEDERAL	$	.00
b. APPLICANT		.00
c. STATE		.00
d. LOCAL		.00
e. OTHER		.00
f. Total	$	.00

13. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF:
- a. APPLICANT
- b. PROJECT

15. PROJECT START DATE (Year month day) 19

16. PROJECT DURATION (Months)

18. DATE DUE TO FEDERAL AGENCY ► (Year month day) 19

14. TYPE OF APPLICATION
A—New; B—Renewal; C—Revision; D—Continuation; E—Augmentation
Enter appropriate letter ☐

17. TYPE OF CHANGE (For 14c or 14e)
A—Increase Dollars; B—Decrease Dollars; C—Increase Duration; D—Decrease Duration; E—Cancellation; F—Other (Specify):
Enter appropriate letter(s) ☐☐☐

19. FEDERAL AGENCY TO RECEIVE REQUEST
- a. ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT (IF APPROPRIATE)
- b. ADMINISTRATIVE CONTACT (IF KNOWN)
- c. ADDRESS

20. EXISTING FEDERAL GRANT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

21. REMARKS ADDED ☐ Yes ☐ No

SECTION II—CERTIFICATION

22. THE APPLICANT CERTIFIES THAT► To the best of my knowledge and belief, data in this preapplication/application are true and correct, the document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is approved.
- a. YES, THIS NOTICE OF INTENT/PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON: DATE _____
- b. NO, PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E.O. 12372 ☐ OR PROGRAM HAS NOT BEEN SELECTED BY STATE FOR REVIEW ☐

23. CERTIFYING REPRESENTATIVE
- a. TYPED NAME AND TITLE
- b. SIGNATURE

SECTION III—FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION

24. APPLICATION RECEIVED (Year month day) 19

25. FEDERAL APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

26. FEDERAL GRANT IDENTIFICATION

27. ACTION TAKEN
- ☐ a. AWARDED
- ☐ b. REJECTED
- ☐ c. RETURNED FOR AMENDMENT
- ☐ d. RETURNED FOR E.O. 12372 SUBMISSION BY APPLICANT TO STATE
- ☐ e. DEFERRED
- ☐ f. WITHDRAWN

28. FUNDING

a. FEDERAL	$	.00
b. APPLICANT		.00
c. STATE		.00
d. LOCAL		.00
e. OTHER		.00
f. TOTAL	$	.00

29. ACTION DATE► (Year month day) 19

30. STARTING DATE (Year month date) 19

31. CONTACT FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (Name and telephone number)

32. ENDING DATE (Year month date) 19

33. REMARKS ADDED ☐ Yes ☐ No

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF–424

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted in accordance with OMB Circular A–102. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that states which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

APPLICANT PROCEDURES FOR SECTION I

Applicant will complete all items in Section I with the exception of Box 3, "State Application Identifier." If an item is not applicable, write "NA." If additional space is needed, insert an asterisk "*," and use Section IV. An explanation follows for each item:

Item

1. Mark appropriate box. Preapplication and application are described in OMB Circular A–102 and Federal agency program instructions. Use of this form as a Notice of Intent is at State option. Federal agencies do not require Notices of Intent.

2a. Applicant's own control number, if desired.

2b. Date Section I is prepared (at applicant's option).

3a. Number assigned by State.

3b. Date assigned by State.

4a–4h. Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of applicant, and name and telephone number of the person who can provide further information about this request.

5. Employer Identification Number (EIN) of applicant as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.

6a. Use Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number assigned to program under which assistance is requested. If more than one program (e.g., joint funding), check "multiple" and explain in Section IV. If unknown, cite Public Law or U.S. Code.

6b. Program title from CFDA. Abbreviate if necessary.

7. Use Section IV to provide a summary description of the project. If appropriate, i.e., if project affects particular sites as, for example, construction or real property projects, attach a map showing the project location.

8. "City" includes town, township or other municipality.

9. List only largest unit or units affected, such as State, county, or city.

10. Estimated number of persons directly benefiting from project.

11. Check the type(s) of assistance requested.

A. Basic Grant—an original request for Federal funds.

B. Supplemental Grant—a request to increase a basic grant in certain cases where the eligible applicant cannot supply the required matching share of the basic Federal program (e.g., grants awarded by the Appalachian Regional Commission to provide the applicant a matching share).

E. Other. Explain in Section IV.

12. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included. If the action is a change in dollar amount of an existing grant

Item

(a revision or augmentation under item 14), indicate only the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amount in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, breakout in Section IV. For multiple program funding, use totals and show program breakouts in Section IV. 12a—amount requested from Federal Government. 12b—amount applicant will contribute. 12c—amount from State, if applicant is not a State. 12d—amount from local government, if applicant is not a local government. 12e—amount from any other sources, explain in Section IV.

13b. The district(s) where most of action work will be accomplished. If city-wide or State-wide, covering several districts, write "city-wide" or "State-wide."

14. A. New. A submittal for project not previously funded.

B. Renewal. An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project having no projected completion date, but for which Federal support must be renewed each year.

C. Revision. A modification to project nature or scope which may result in funding change (increase or decrease).

D. Continuation. An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.

E. Augmentation. A requirement for additional funds for a project previously awarded funds in the same funding/budget period. Project nature and scope unchanged.

15. Approximate date project expected to begin (usually associated with estimated date of availability of funding).

16. Estimated number of months to complete project after Federal funds are available.

17. Complete only for revisions (item 14c), or augmentations (item 14e).

18. Date preapplication/application must be submitted to Federal agency in order to be eligible for funding consideration.

19. Name and address of the Federal agency to which this request is addressed. Indicate as clearly as possible the name of the office to which the application will be delivered.

20. Existing Federal grant identification number if this is not a new request and directly relates to a previous Federal action. Otherwise, write "NA."

21. Check appropriate box as to whether Section IV of form contains remarks and/or additional remarks are attached.

APPLICANT PROCEDURES FOR SECTION II

Applicants will always complete either item 22a or 22b *and* items 23a and 23b.

22a. Complete if application is subject to Executive Order 12372 (State review and comment).

22b. Check if application is not subject to E.O. 12372.

23a. Name and title of authorized representative of legal applicant.

FEDERAL AGENCY PROCEDURES FOR SECTION III

Applicant completes only Sections I and II. Section III is completed by Federal agencies.

26. Use to identify award actions.

27. Use Section IV to amplify where appropriate.

28. Amount to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions will be included. If the action is a change in dollar amount of an existing grant (a revision or augmentation under item 14), indicate only the amount of change. For decreases, enclose the amount in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, breakout in Section IV. For multiple program funding, use totals and show program breakouts in Section IV. 28a—amount awarded by Federal Government. 28b—amount applicant will contribute. 28c—amount from State, if applicant is not a State. 28d—amount from local government, if applicant is not a local government. 28e—amount from any other sources, explain in Section IV.

29. Date action was taken on this request.

30. Date funds will become available.

31. Name and telephone number of agency person who can provide more information regarding this assistance.

32. Date after which funds will no longer be available for obligation.

33. Check appropriate box as to whether Section IV of form contains Federal remarks and/or attachment of additional remarks.

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This request for information meets the requirements set forth in P.L. 96-511 § 3507. Submission of the information requested on this application is required in order to obtain benefits in accordance with OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110. No grant may be awarded unless a completed application has been submitted (P.L. 96-157, section 802). Information provided will be used by JSIA agency personnel in determining which projects related to criminal justice should be funded. Second, it will be used to report to clearinghouses on major actions taken on applications reviewed by clearinghouses in accordance with OMB Circular A-95. Third, it will be used by Federal agencies to notify States of grants-in-aid awarded in accordance with Treasury Circular 1082. Fourth, it may be used, on an optional basis, as a notification of intent from applicants to clearinghouses, as an early initial notice that Federal assistance is to be applied for (clearinghouse procedures will govern).

APPLICATION PROCEDURES FOR SECTION I

Applicant will complete all items in Section I. If an item is not applicable, write "NA". If additional space is needed, insert an asterisk "*" and use the remarks section on the back of the form. An explanation follows for each item:

Item

1. Mark appropriate box. Pre-application and application guidance is in OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110, and Federal agency program instructions. Notification of intent guidance is in Circular A-95 and procedures from clearinghouse. Applicant will not use "Report of Federal Action" box.

2a. Applicant's own control number, if desired.

2b. Date Section I is prepared.

3a. Number assigned by State clearinghouse, or if delegated by State, by areawide clearinghouse. All requests to Federal agencies *must* contain this identifier if the program is covered by Circular A-95 and required by applicable State/areawide clearinghouse procedures. If in doubt, consult your clearinghouse.

3b. Date applicant notified of clearinghouse identifier.

4a-4h. Legal name of applicant/recipient, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of applicant, and name and telephone number of person who can provide further information about this request.

5. Employer identification number of applicant as assigned by Internal Revenue Service.

6a. Use Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number assigned to program under which assistance is requested. If more than one program (e.g., joint-funding) write "multiple" and explain in remarks. If unknown, cite Public Law or U.S. Code.

6b. Program title from Federal Catalog. Abbreviate if necessary.

7. Brief title and appropriate description of project. For notification of intent, continue in remarks section if necessary to convey proper description.

8. Mostly self-explanatory. "City" includes town, township or other municipality.

9. Check the type(s) of assistance requested. The definitions of the terms are:

   A. Basic Grant. An original request for Federal funds. This would not include any contribution provided under a supplemental grant.

   B. Supplemental Grant. A request to increase a basic grant in certain cases where the eligible applicant cannot supply the required matching share of the basic Federal program (e.g., grants awarded by the Appalachian Regional Commission to provide the applicant a matching share).

   C. Loan. Self explanatory.

   D. Insurance. Self explanatory.

   E. Other. Explain on remarks page.

Item

10. Governmental unit where significant and meaningful impact could be observed. List only largest unit or units affected, such as State, county, or city. If entire unit affected, list it rather than subunits.

11. Estimated number of persons directly benefiting from project.

12. Use appropriate code letter. Definitions are:

   A. New. A submittal for the first time for a new project.

   B. Renewal. An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project having no projected completion date, but for which Federal support must be renewed each year.

   C. Revision. A modification to project nature or scope which may result in funding change (increase or decrease).

   D. Continuation. An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project the agency initially agreed to fund for a definite number of years.

   E. Augmentation. A requirement for additional funds for a project previously awarded funds in the same funding/budget period. Project nature and scope unchanged.

13. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions will be included. If the action is a change in dollar amount of an existing grant (a revision or augmentation), indicate only the amount of the change. For decreases enclose the amount in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, break out in remarks. For multiple program funding, use totals and show program breakouts in remarks. Item definitions: 13a, amount requested from Federal Government; 13b, amount applicant will contribute; 13c, amount from State, if applicant is not a State; 13d, amount from local government, if applicant is not a local government; 13e, amount from any other sources, explain in remarks.

14a. Self explanatory.

14b. The district(s) where most of actual work will be accomplished. If city-wide or State-wide, covering several districts, write "city-wide" or "State-wide."

15. Complete only for revisions (item 12c), or augmentations (item 12e).

16. Approximate date project expected to begin (usually associated with estimated date of availability of funding).

17. Estimated number of months to complete project after Federal funds are available.

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

APPLICANT PROCEDURES FOR SECTION I *(continued)*

Item	
18.	Estimated date pre-application/application will be submitted to Federal agency if this project requires clearinghouse review. If review not required, this date would usually be same as date in item 2b.
19.	Existing Federal identification number if this is not a new request and directly relates to a previous Federal action. Otherwise write "NA".
20.	Indicate Federal agency to which this request is addressed. Street address not required, but do use ZIP.
21.	Check appropriate box as to whether Section IV of form contains remarks and/or additional remarks attached.

APPLICANT PROCEDURES FOR SECTION II

Applicants will always complete items 23a, 23b, and 23c. If clearinghouse review is required, item 22b must be fully completed. An explanation follows for each item:

Item	
22b.	List clearinghouses to which submitted and show in appropriate blocks the status of their responses. For more than three clearinghouses, continue in remarks section. All written comments submitted by or through clearinghouses must be attached.
23a.	Name and title of authorized representative of legal applicant.
23b.	Self explanatory.
23c.	Self explanatory.
Note:	Applicant completes only Sections I and II. Section III is completed by Federal agencies.

FEDERAL AGENCY PROCEDURES FOR SECTION III

If applicant-supplied information in Sections I and II needs no updating or adjustment to fit the final Federal action, the Federal agency will complete Section III only. An explanation for each item follows:

Item	
24.	Execute department or independent agency having program administration responsibility.
25.	Self explanatory.
26.	Primary organizational unit below department level having direct program management responsibility.
27.	Office directly monitoring the program.
28.	Use to identify non-award actions where Federal grant identifier in item 30 is not applicable or will not suffice.
29.	Complete address of administering office shown in item 26.
30.	Use to identify award actions where different from Federal application identifier in item 28.
31.	Self explanatory. Use remarks section to amplify where appropriate.
32.	Amount to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions will be included. If the action is a change in dollar amount of an existing grant (a revision or augmentation), indicate only the amount of change. For decreases, enclose the amount in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, break out in remarks. For multiple program funding, use totals and show program breakouts in remarks. Item definitions: 32a, amount awarded by Federal Government; 32b, amount applicant will contribute; 32c, amount from State, if applicant is not a State; 32d, amount from local government if applicant is not a local government; 32e, amount from any other sources, explain in remarks.
33.	Date action was taken on this request.
34.	Date funds will become available.
35.	Name and telephone no. of agency person who can provide more information regarding this assistance.
36.	Date after which funds will no longer be available.
37.	Check appropriate box as to whether Section IV of form contains Federal remarks and/or attachment of additional remarks.
38.	For use with A-95 actions notices only. Name and telephone of person who can assure that appropriate A-95 action has been taken — if same as person shown in item 35, write "same". If not applicable, write "NA".

Federal Agency Procedures — special considerations

A. *Treasury Circular 1082 compliance.* Federal agency will assure proper completion of Sections I and III. If Section I is being completed by Federal agency, all applicable items must be filled in. Addresses of State Information Reception Agencies (SCIRA's) are provided by Treasury Department to each agency. This form replaces SF 240, which will no longer be used.

B. *OMB Circular A-95 compliance.* Federal agency will assure proper completion of Sections I, II and III. This form is required for notifying all reviewing clearinghouses of major actions on all programs reviewed under A-95. Addresses of State and areawide clearinghouses are provided by OMB to each agency. Substantive differences between applicant's request and/or clearinghouse recommendations, and the project as finally awarded will be explained in A-95 notifications to clearinghouses.

C. *Special note.* In most, but not all States, the A-95 State clearinghouse and the (TC 1082) SCIRA are the same office. In such cases, the A-95 award notice to the State clearinghouse will fulfill the TC 1082 award notice requirement to the State SCIRA. Duplicate notification should be avoided.

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

PART II
PROJECT APPROVAL INFORMATION

Item 1.
Does this assistance request require State, local, regional, or other priority rating?

_____ Yes _____ No

Name of Governing Body _____
Priority Rating _____

Item 2.
Does this assistance request require State, or local advisory, educational or health clearances?

_____ Yes _____ No

Name of Agency or Board _____
(Attach Documentation)

Item 3.
Does this assistance request require clearinghouse review in accordance with OMB Circular A-95?

_____ Yes _____ No

(Attach Comments)

Item 4.
Does this assistance request require State, local, regional or other planning approval?

_____ Yes _____ No

Name of Approving Agency _____
Date _____

Item 5.
Is the proposed project covered by an approved comprehensive plan?

_____ Yes _____ No

Check one: State ☐
Local ☐
Regional ☐
Location of Plan _____

Item 6.
Will the assistance requested serve a Federal installation?

_____ Yes _____ No

Name of Federal Installation _____
Federal Population benefiting from Project _____

Item 7.
Will the assistance requested be on Federal land or installation?

_____ Yes _____ No

Name of Federal Installation _____
Location of Federal Land _____
Percent of Project _____

Item 8.
Will the assistance requested have an impact or effect on the environment?

_____ Yes _____ No

See instructions for additional information to be provided.

Item 8.
Will the assistance requested cause the displacement of individuals, families, businesses, or farms?

_____ Yes _____ No

Number of:
Individuals _____
Families _____
Businesses _____
Farms _____

Item 10.
Is there other related assistance on this project previous, pending, or anticipated?

_____ Yes _____ No

See instructions for additional information to be provided.

Item 11.
Is the project in a designated flood area?

_____ Yes _____ No

See instructions for additional information to be provided.

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

INSTRUCTIONS

PART II

Negative answers will not require an explanation unless the Federal agency requests more information at a later date. Provide supplementary date for all "Yes" answers in the space provided in accordance with the following instructions:

Item 1 — Provide the name of the governing body establishing the priority system and the priority rating assigned to this project.

Item 2 — Provide the name of the agency or board which issued the clearance and attach the documentation of status or approval.

Item 3 — Attach the clearinghouse comments for the application in accordance with the instructions contained in Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-95. If comments were submitted previously with a preapplication, do not submit them again but any additional comments received from the clearinghouse should be submitted with this application.

Item 4 — Furnish the name of the approving agency and the approval date.

Item 5 — Show whether the approved comprehensive plan is State, local or regional, or if none of these, explain the scope of the plan. Give the location where the approved plan is available for examination and state whether this project is in conformance with the plan.

Item 6 — Show the population residing or working on the Federal installation who will benefit from this project.

Item 7 — Show the percentage of the project work that will be conducted on federally-owned or leased land. Give the name of the Federal installation and its location.

Item 8 — Describe briefly the possible beneficial and harmful impact on the environment of the proposed project. If an adverse environmental impact is anticipated, explain what action will be taken to minimize the impact. Federal agencies will provide separate instructions if additional data is needed.

Item 9 — State the number of individuals, families, businesses, or farms this project will displace. Federal agencies will provide separate instructions if additional data is needed.

Item 10 — Show the Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog number, the program name, the type of assistance, the status and the amount of each project where there is related previous, pending or anticipated assistance. Use additional sheets, if needed.

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

OJARS Form 4000/3 (Rev. 6-81)
Attachment to SF-424

PART III – BUDGET INFORMATION

SECTION A – BUDGET SUMMARY

Grant Program, Function or Activity (a)	Federal Catalog No. (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	Total (g)
1.		$	$	$	$	$
2.						
3.						
4.						
5. TOTALS		$	$	$	$	$

SECTION B – BUDGET CATEGORIES

6. Object Class Categories	– Grant Program, Function or Activity				Total (5)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
a. Personnel	$	$	$	$	$
b. Fringe Benefits					
c. Travel					
d. Equipment					
e. Supplies					
f. Contractual					
g. Construction					
h. Other					
i. Total Direct Charges					
j. Indirect Charges					
k. TOTALS	$	$	$	$	$
7. Program Income	$	$	$	$	$

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

INSTRUCTIONS

PART III

General Instructions

This form is designed so that application can be made for funds from one or more grant programs. In preparing the budget, adhere to any existing Federal grantor agency guidelines which prescribe how and whether budgeted amounts should be separately shown for different functions or activities within the program. For some programs, grantor agencies may require budgets to be separately shown by function or activity. For other programs, grantor agencies may not require a breakdown by function or activity. Sections A, B, C, and D should include budget estimates for the whole project except when applying for assistance which requires Federal authorization in annual or other funding period increments. In the latter case, Sections A, B, C, and D should provide the budget for the first budget period (usually a year) and Section E should present the need for Federal assistance in the subsequent budget periods. All applications should contain a breakdown by the object class categories shown in Lines a-k of Section B.

Section A. Budget Summary
Lines 1-4, Columns (a) and (b).

For applications pertaining to a *single* Federal grant program (Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog number) and *not requiring* a functional or activity breakdown, enter on Line 1 under Column (a) the catalog program title and the catalog number in Column (b).

For applications pertaining to a *single* program *requiring* budget amounts by multiple functions or activities, enter the name of each activity or function on each line in Column (a), and enter the catalog number in Column (b). For applications pertaining to *multiple* programs where *none* of the programs *require* a breakdown by function or activity, enter the catalog program title on each line in Column (a) and the respective catalog number on each line in Column (b).

For applications pertaining to *multiple* programs where one or more programs *require* a breakdown by function or activity, prepare a separate sheet for each program requiring the breakdown. Additional sheets should be used when one form does not provide adequate space for all breakdown of data required. However, when more than one sheet is used, the first page should provide the summary totals by programs.

Lines 1-4, Columns (c) through (g).

For new applications, leave Columns (c) and (d) blank. For each line entry in Columns (a) and (b), enter in Columns (e), (f), and (g) the appropriate amounts of funds needed to support the project for the first funding period (usually a year).

For continuing grant program applications, submit these forms before the end of each funding period as required by the grantor agency. Enter in Columns (c) and (d) the estimated amounts of funds which will remain unobligated at the end of the grant funding period *only* if the Federal grantor agency instructions provide for this. Otherwise, leave these columns blank. Enter in columns (e) and (f) the amounts of funds needed for the upcoming period. The amount(s) in Column (g) should be the sum of amounts in Columns (e) and (f).

For supplemental grants and changes to existing grants, do not use Columns (c) and (d). Enter in Column (e) the amount of the increase or decrease of Federal funds and enter in Column (f) the amount of the increase or decrease of non-Federal funds. In Column (g) enter the new total budgeted amount (Federal and non-Federal) which includes the total previous authorized budgeted amounts plus or minus, as appropriate, the amounts shown in Columns (e) and (f). The amount(s) shown in Column (g) should *not* equal the sum of amounts in Columns (e) and (f).

Line 5 — Show the totals for all columns used.

Section B. Budget Categories

In the column headings (1) through (4), enter the titles of the same programs, functions, and activities shown on Lines 1-4, Column (a), Section A. When additional sheets were prepared for Section A, provide similar column headings on each sheet. For each program, function or activity, fill in the total requirements for funds (both Federal and non-Federal) by object class categories.

Lines 6a-h — Show the estimated amount for each direct cost budget (object class) category for each column with program, function or activity heading.

Line 6i — Show the totals of Lines 6a to 6h in each column.

Line 6j — Show the amount of indirect cost. Refer to OMB Circulars A-87, A-21 and A-122.

Line 6k — Enter the total of amounts on Lines 6i and 6j. For all applications for new grants and continuation grants the total amount in Column (5), Line 6k, should be the same as the total amount shown in Section A, Column (g), Line 5. For supplemental grants and changes to grants, the total amount of the increase or decrease as shown in Columns (1)-(4), Line 6k should be the same as the sum of the amounts in Section A, Columns (e) and (f) on Line 5. When additional sheets were prepared, the last two sentences apply only to the first page with summary totals.

Line 7 — Enter the estimated amount of income, if any, expected to be generated from this project. Do not add or subtract this amount from the total project amount. Show under the program narrative statement the nature and source of income. The estimated amount of program income may be considered by the Federal grantor agency in determining the total amount of the grant.

Section C. Source of Non-Federal Resources

Line 8-11 — Enter amounts of non-Federal resources that will be used on the grant. If in-kind contributions are included, provide a brief explanation on a separate sheet. (See Attachment F, OMB Circular A-102 or Attachment E, OMB Circular A-110, as applicable.)

Column (a) — Enter the program titles identical to Column (a), Section A. A breakdown by function or activity is not necessary.

Column (b) — Enter the amount of cash and in-kind contributions to be made by the applicant as shown in Section A. (See also Attachment F, OMB Circular A-102 or Attachment E, OMB Circular A-110, as applicable.)

Column (c) — Enter the State contribution if the applicant is *not* a State or State agency. Applicants which are a State or State agencies should leave this column blank.

Column (d) — Enter the amount of cash and in-kind contributions to be made from all other sources.

Column (e) — Enter totals of Columns (b), (c), and (d).

Line 12 — Enter the total for each of Columns (b)-(e). The amount in Column (e) should be equal to the amount on Line 5, Column (f), Section A.

Section D. Forcasted Cash Needs

Line 13 — Enter the amount of cash needed by quarter from the grantor agency during the first year.

Line 14 — Enter the amount of cash from all other sources needed by quarter during the first year.

Line 15 — Enter the totals of amounts on Lines 13 and 14.

Section E. Budget Estimates of Federal Funds Needed for Balance of the Project

Lines 16-19 — Enter in Column (a) the same grant program titles shown in Column (a), Section A. A breakdown by function or activity is not necessary. For new applications and continuing grant applications, enter in the proper columns amounts of Federal funds which will be needed to complete the program or project over the succeeding funding periods (usually in years). This Section need not be completed for amendments, changes, or supplements to funds for the current year of existing grants.

If more than four lines are needed to list the program titles submit additional schedules as necessary.

Line 20 — Enter the total for each of the Columns (b)-(e). When additional schedules are prepared for this Section, annotate accordingly and show the overall totals on this line.

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

OJARS Form 4000/3 (Rev. 6-81)
Attachment to SF-424

SECTION C — NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES

(a) Grant Program	(b) APPLICANT	(c) STATE	(d) OTHER SOURCES	(e) TOTALS
8.	$	$	$	$
9.				
10.				
11.				
12. TOTALS	$	$	$	$

SECTION D — FORECASTED CASH NEEDS

	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
13. Federal	$	$	$	$	$
14. Non-Federal					
15. TOTAL	$	$	$	$	$

SECTION E — BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT

(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (YEARS)			
	(b) FIRST	(c) SECOND	(d) THIRD	(e) FOURTH
16.	$	$	$	$
17.				
18.				
19.				
20. TOTALS	$	$	$	$

SECTION F — OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION

(Attach Additional Sheets If Necessary)

21. Direct Charges:

22. Indirect Charges:

23. Remarks:

OMB No.: 1121-0012
Expires 9/30/86

INSTRUCTIONS

PART III (continued)

Section F — Other Budget Information.

Line 21 — Use this space to explain amounts for individual direct object cost categories that may appear to be out of the ordinary or to explain the details as required by the Federal grantor agency.

Line 22 — Enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, pre-determined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period, the estimated amount of the base to which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expense.

Line 23 — Provide any other explanations required herein or any other comments deemed necessary.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must provide on a separate sheet a budget narrative which will detail by budget category, the Federal and non-Federal (in-kind and cash) share. The grantee cash contribution should be identified as to its source, i.e., funds appropriated by a State or local government or donation from a private source. The narrative should relate the items budgeted to project activities and should provide a justification and explanation for the budgeted items including the criteria and data used to arrive at the estimates for each budget category.

OMB NO. 1121-0012
EXPIRES 9/30/86

INSTRUCTIONS

PART IV
PROGRAM NARRATIVE

Prepare the program narrative statement in accordance with the following instructions for all new grant programs. Requests for continuation or refunding and changes on an approved project should respond to item 5b only. Requests for supplemental assistance should respond to question 5c only.

1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR THIS ASSISTANCE.

Pinpoint any relevant physical, economic, social, financial, institutional, or other problems requiring a solution. Demonstrate the need for assistance and state the principal and subordinate objectives of the project. Supporting documentation or other testimonies from concerned interests other than the applicant may be used. Any relevant data based on planning studies should be included or footnoted.

2. RESULTS OR BENEFITS EXPECTED.

Identify results and benefits to be derived. For example, when applying for a grant to establish a neighborhood health center provide a description of who will occupy the facility, how the facility will be used, and how the facility will benefit the general public.

3. APPROACH.

a. Outline a plan of action pertaining to the scope and detail of how the proposed work will be accomplished for each grant program, function or activity, provided in the budget. Cite factors which might accelerate or decelerate the work and your reason for taking this approach as opposed to others. Describe any unusual features of the project such as design or technological innovations, reductions in cost or time, or extraordinary social and community involvement.

b. Provide for each grant program, function or activity, quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved in such terms as the number of jobs created; the number of people served; and the number of patients treated. When accomplishments cannot be quantified by activity or function, list them in chronological order to show the schedule of accomplishments and their target dates.

c. Identify the kinds of data to be collected and maintained and discuss the criteria to be used to evaluate the results and successes of the project. Explain the methodoloy that will be used to determine if the needs identified and discussed are being met and if the results and benefits identified in item 2 are being achieved.

d. List organizations, cooperators, consultants, or other key individuals who will work on the project along with a short description of the nature of their effort or contribution.

4. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION.

Give a precise location of the project or area to be served by the proposed project. Maps or other graphic aids may be attached.

5. IF APPLICABLE, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

a. For research or demonstration assistance requests, present a biographical sketch of the program director with the following information; name, address, phone number, background, and other qualifying experience for the project. Also, list the name, training and background for other key personnel engaged in the project.

b. Discuss accomplishments to date and list in chronological order a schedule of accomplishments, progress or milestones anticipated with the new funding request. If there have been significant changes in the project objectives, location approach, or time delays, explain and justify. For other requests for changes or amendments, explain the reason for the change(s). If the scope or objectives have changed or an extension of time is necessary, explain the circumstances and justify. If the total budget items have changed more than the prescribed limits contained in Attachment K to OMB Circular A-102 (or Attachment J to OMB Circular A-110, as applicable), explain and justify the change and its effect on the project.

c. For supplemental assistance requests, explain the reason for the request and justify the need for additional funding.

OMB NO. 1121-0012
EXPIRES 9/30/86

PART V

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies that he will comply with the regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements; including OMB Circulars No's. A-95, A-102, A-110, A-122, and A-87, as they relate to the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies to the grant that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.
2. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and in accordance with Title VI of that Act, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance and will immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this agreement.
3. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d) prohibiting employment discrimination where (1) the primary purpose of a grants is to provide employment or (2) discriminatory employment practices will result in unequal treatment of persons who are or should be benefiting from the grant-aided activity.
4. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally assisted programs.
5. It will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activity of employees.
6. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, as they apply to hospital and educational institution employees of State and local governments.
7. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.
8. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General through any authorized representative the access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.
9. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.
10. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.
11. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.
12. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 469a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.
13. It will comply with the provision of 28 CFR Part 20 regulating the privacy and security of criminal history information systems.
14. All published material and written reports submitted under this grant or in conjunction with the third party agreements under this grant will be originally developed material unless otherwise specifically provided for in the grant document. Material not originally developed included in reports will have the source identified either in the body of the report or in a footnote, whether the material is in a verbatim or extensive paraphrase format. All published material and written reports shall give notice that funds were provided under an LEAA, NIJ, BJS, OJJDP or OJARS grant.
15. Requests for proposal or invitations for bid issued by the grantee or a subgrantee to implement the grant or subgrant project will provide notice to prospective bidders that the grantor agency organizational conflict of interest provision is applicable in that contractors that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work and/or RFP's for a proposed procurement shall be excluded from bidding or submitting a proposal to compete for the award of such procurement.
16. It will comply with the provisions of 28 CFR 42.101 et seq. prohibiting discrimination based on race, color or national origin by or through its contractual arrangements. If the grantee is an institution or a governmental agency, office or unit then this assurance of nondiscrimination by race, color or national origin extends to discrimination anywhere in the institution or governmental agency, office, or unit.
17. If the grantee is a unit of state or local government, state planning agency or law enforcement agency, it will comply with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and 28 CFR 42.201 et seq. prohibiting discrimination in employment practices based on race, color, creed, sex or national origin. Additionally, it will obtain assurances from all subgrantees, contractors and subcontractors that they will not discriminate in employment practices based on race, color, creed, sex or national origin.

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1985 491-518/46692

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/NIJ
Permit No. G–91